

CATHOLICISM AND THE ROMAN IMPERIAL CULT

IT is, of course, a commonplace with Christians that the political, social and economic conditions obtaining under the early Roman Empire were of precisely the kind to promote the rapid spread of a new religion, and, more particularly, of a universal and Catholic religion such as Christianity. There is no need to emphasize the extent to which St. Paul and other early Christian missionaries were indebted to the *Pax Romana*, the absence of war within the Empire's borders; to the Roman roads and to the systematization and facilitation of travel by land and by sea; to the freedom of intercommunication and of trade between the Empire's various parts; to the protection and security provided by the diffusion of Roman law, Roman administration and Roman citizenship throughout the ancient world. Again, the Christian missionary preaching the universal brotherhood and solidarity of the human race, insisting upon the essential equality of all men in the eyes of God and gathering them into one Church, covering the whole earth, in which there was "neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free," could appeal to the very nature of the Roman Empire itself—a single *cosmopolis* or world-state of the inhabited earth—*ἡ οἰκουμένη*—where no barriers of colour or of nationality were to be found; where, in fact, nationalism, in our sense of the term, was non-existent; where no differences of blood interfered with inter-marriage, but where, as an inscription from South Shields informs us, a Romano-Oriental from Palmyra could marry a Romano-British wife and settle down for the rest of his days in the neighbourhood of Hadrian's Wall;¹ where the *carrière ouverte* for members of all races, ranks and tongues was an actual reality. The Christian missionary could, indeed, point to an existing system which was the translation into political fact of the Stoic philosophic theory of the universe as a perfect unity, a single nature or substance, controlled by Reason, Logos or God; a theory which Marcus Aurelius, Roman Emperor and Stoic philosopher, voiced in his *Meditations* when he exclaimed "O Nature! from thee are all things, in thee all things subsist, and to thee all tend.

¹ "Ephemeris Epigraphica," iv. 718a. "D. M. Regina liberta et conjuge, Barates Palmyrenus, natione Catuallauna, an. xxx." Cf. "Eph. Epigr." ix. 1153a.

The poet says, 'Dear City of Cecrops'; but wilt thou not say, 'Dear City of God?' And here, in terminology, at any rate, we are not far from the Kingdom of Heaven, the *Civitas Dei*, St. Augustine's City of God.

But with this familiar aspect of the Roman Empire as a *praeparatio Evangelii* we are not now primarily concerned. The subject of this paper may, indeed, sound somewhat paradoxical. It is an attempt to discover the place occupied in that *praeparatio* by one very important and well-known factor in the religious life of the Roman Empire, a factor which, to the Christians of the Roman Imperial period seemed, and at that time rightly seemed, to be the very antithesis and irreconcilable foe of the Gospel, and which the Church condemned, and, of course, rightly condemned without modification or compromise, namely, Emperor-worship or the Imperial cult. Their refusal to participate in Emperor-worship, to pay to a created human being the divine honours due to the Creator alone, was, naturally, the point at issue between the early Christians and the Roman authorities, inasmuch as participation in the Imperial cult was regarded by the Imperial government as the hall-mark of loyalty to the political system of the Empire which the Emperor represented. Obviously Christianity could make no compromise whatsoever with any form of ruler-worship. There was no room for the man-god, man-made-god, the human being deified, in a Church which adored the God-Man, God-made-Man, the Deity Incarnate in human form. Uncompromisingly, throughout the first three centuries of her history, the Church condemned in the Imperial cult, as she condemns in aggressive nationalism to-day, "the pagan worship of the State." Yet, granted this absolute and complete irreconcilability between the practice of the Imperial cult and the practice of Catholicism, it is, perhaps, not impossible, as we look back over the history of the Church, to trace in the former certain elements used by God to prepare the mind by analogy, as it were, for the truths of the Catholic Faith.

The facts of Emperor-worship described below are perfectly familiar to all students of Roman Imperial history. This paper has no new contribution to make to our knowledge of the subject in itself. Its purpose is to consider a small selection of these familiar facts from what may claim to be, in this connection, a somewhat unfamiliar point of view. And,

¹ "M. Antoninus Imperator ad se ipsum," iv. 23. *ἐκεῖνος μὲν φησιν* · 'ὁ πάλι φίλην Κέκροπος' σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἐρεῖς 'ὁ πάλι φίλην Διὸς';

moreover, at this particular moment in Catholic history, when the national state, with a national "religion," is seeking, as it has sought before, to attract men *from* the Church, it may not be without interest to study the suggestion that men were, in the beginning, indirectly attracted to the Church by a universal state, with a universal religion.

It is obvious, in the first place, that the worship of the Roman Emperors must have played a part in preparing the pagan mind for the reception of a monotheistic creed. For it was upon the worship of the divine ruler and lord of the whole earth that the various monotheistic tendencies in the religious thought of paganism were focusing, until, towards the end of the third century of our era, after the Emperor Aurelian had promoted in the West the cult, long established in the East, of *Sol Invictus*, the Emperor was regarded as the vice-regent, and even as the actual emanation, of the Sun-god, the single deity in whose worship the worship of all other deities was embraced. This aspect of late third-century Emperor-worship is expressed very clearly in contemporary art, for instance, in a scene depicting an Imperial largess or *congiarium* from the frieze of Constantinian date on the Arch of Constantine in Rome.¹ The Emperor is seated in the midst of his court, represented on a slightly larger scale than the other figures and completely isolated from them, inasmuch as he gazes straight out before him, paying no attention to, and apparently unaware of the presence of, the throng of citizens that press around him. He is a kind of transcendental being, summing up in his own person all the powers, human and Divine, that move the Roman world. The ancient world, in fact, is now worshipping a single deity incarnate in human form. There is a striking analogy in *motif*, and even in conception, between this purely pagan scene and the well known *Maiestas Christi* carved in the *tympanum* of the twelfth-century Royal Porch of Chartres Cathedral, displaying the Christian presentation of the truth after which the pagan world was feeling. We observe the same principle of representing the central Divine Figure on a larger—here much larger—scale than the rest, the same isolation of the Figure, the same detachment of It from Its surroundings. On the Roman arch Constantine gazes out upon his world-Empire and bestows material gifts: at Chartres Christ gazes out upon His world-Empire and bestows His Benediction. At

¹ E. Strong, "La scultura romana," II., p. 337, fig. 208.

Chartres the Emperor, the man-made-god, has indeed been replaced by Christ, the God-made-Man; and in place of the courtiers of Rome or Byzantium we see the company of those who dwell in the courts of Heaven.¹

In the second place, it would seem not improbable that the worship of the Roman Emperor had a share in acclimatizing, as it were, the pagan world to the idea of one great benefactor and friend of man, of a "saviour," in fact. For this very familiar aspect of ruler-worship we must, of course, go back to the period of Alexander's successors, the Hellenistic kings, who in an age of transition and uncertainty, when the old order of the city-state was passing away and the new order of Empire had not as yet fully appeared, provided their subjects, to some extent, at any rate, with stability, prosperity and peace, and were, in consequence, hailed by them as Antiochus *Epiphanes* (God-made-manifest), Ptolemy *Euergetes* (the Benefactor), Ptolemy *Soter* (the Saviour)—titles expressive, not of mere adulation only, but of genuine gratitude. Later, when the world-power shifted from the Hellenistic kingdoms to Rome, the titles of Benefactor and Saviour shifted likewise to the men who represented and wielded the power and authority of Rome, who were, as it were, incarnations of the *Dea Roma*, of all that Rome stood for. And, indeed, of all "saviour-kings" in the ancient world the greatest by far was the Emperor Augustus. Alexander had died with his work of "salvation" uncompleted. The "salvation" brought by the Hellenistic kings was, after all, only partial at the best. Julius Caesar by his final victory had scarcely saved the world from civil strife before he plunged it once again by his death into thirteen more weary years of warfare.

"Hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo | ne prohibete" (suffer this youth at least to save our ruined world)—was Virgil's prayer for the young Octavian in the first *Georgic*,² written before the victory of Actium was won; and we know how that prayer was answered; how Augustus brought σωτηρία, "salvation," the *Pax Romana*, restoring a shattered world to prosperity and peace; we know his solution of the world's problem, the blending of East and West, of Greece and Rome, in the universal kingdom, the Graeco-Roman world-state, the great political frame-work constructed by Rome wherein to enshrine the civilization created by Greece. Augustus did indeed earn the gratitude of the ancient

¹ Cf. E. Strong, "Apotheosis and After-Life," pp. 34 ff., 106.

² v. 500.

world. Contemporary poetry is full of this idea of him as a divine "saviour." Ovid, for example, calls him *praesens conspicuusque deus* (god-with-us, visible);¹ Propertius even describes him as *servator mundi* (saviour of the world).² The very name "Augustus" implied, of course, divinity, and divinity earned as a reward for services done to mankind—*Αὔγουστος ὡς καὶ πλεῖον τι ἢ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἐπεκλήθη* (He was called Augustus as being something more than man).³ Thus it was under an earthly "saviour" that our Divine Saviour willed to be born; and we may, from our standpoint, interpret in a Christian sense the Greek inscription which hails Augustus as "the saviour . . . through whom have come good tidings (*εὐαγγέλια*)."⁴

So far we have considered two obvious ways in which the Imperial cult may have contributed towards the preparation of men's minds for the Christian doctrines, first, of One God and of Christ as the One God Incarnate, and, secondly, of Christ as the Divine Saviour of mankind. We will now investigate aspects of Emperor-worship in which we may detect some sort of reflection of, or analogy with, the Catholic doctrine of the Papacy.

Closely allied to the idea of the Roman Emperor as the "saviour" and benefactor of mankind was the idea of the Empire as a stewardship or trust, as a protectorate of the whole world, and of the Emperor as the delegate or vice-regent of God, whose whole *raison d'être* was the service of the human race. Even before the actual establishment of the Principate we find Cicero in his *De Officiis*⁵ describing the ideal of the senatorial government in the best days of the Roman Republic as a "protectorate of the whole world"—*patrocinium orbis terrae*; and Dr. Mackail, in his essay entitled "The Lesson of Imperial Rome," says of the personal rule of the Emperors that "it substituted, for the selfish and irresponsible rule of a class, the autocracy of a single *hard-worked and hard-working* man whose office made him something all but superhuman. . . Each successor [to the Empire] in turn took up the *Augustum commilitium* . . . as the first servant of the Commonwealth, *servus servorum Romae*."⁶ Imperial art provides us with a very remarkable illustration of this aspect

¹ "Tristia," II. 53.

² IV. (V.), vi. 37.

³ Cassius Dion, 53, 16.

⁴ Wendland, "Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur," p. 409, no. 8: decree of κοινόν of Asiatic cities on occasion of Augustus' birthday, 9–8 B.C. Augustus is described as σωτήρα . . . παύσαντα μὲν πόλεμον κοσμήσαντα δὲ πάντα: his birthday was the beginning of good tidings for the world, ἤρξεν δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ τῶν δι' αὐτὸν εὐαγγελία τοῦ θεοῦ.

⁵ II., viii. 27.

⁶ Pp. 24, 25.

of the Emperor's office in a pair of sculptured panels from the attic of the famous Arch of Trajan at Beneventum.¹ On these reliefs we see the Emperor Trajan, accompanied by members of his staff, being received on the Capitol by *Italia*, the two Consuls and the *Penates*, and by the Capitoline Triad—Jupiter, Juno and Minerva—accompanied by four other Italian deities, doing their part in welcoming the ruler of the Roman world. The gesture of Jupiter is unmistakable; in his extended right hand he is offering to Trajan his *fulmen* or thunderbolt, the symbol of his sovereignty. He is delegating his powers to the man-god, to the Roman Emperor, the *pater patriae*, his vicar or vice-regent on earth. The scene might almost have been designed to illustrate the words of Pliny in his *Panegyricus Traiani*—"Such a rule as yours [*i.e.*, Trajan's] is, as I conceive it, exercised by the father of the universe himself, [who] . . . has given you to the world to fulfil his function as guardian of the human race."² But these sculptured reliefs also recall in a most striking way a far more famous and immortal scene enacted at Cæsarea Philippi, a scene in which the gift, the symbol of the powers delegated to another *Pater Patriae*, was, not a thunderbolt, but keys.

Secondly, in the distinction which the inhabitants of the Roman Empire drew between the personal character of the Emperor as an individual human being, and his office as representative and embodiment of the power of Rome and of the blessings of Roman rule, we may see foreshadowed the distinction which every Catholic draws between the personal character and private behaviour of the Pope, and his office and function as Vicar of Christ, as supreme pastor and teacher of all Christians. Nero is, perhaps, as described for us in the lurid pages of Tacitus and Suetonius, the blackest of all the Emperors on the Imperial "black list"; and, no doubt, with due allowances made for personal bias and a highly developed sense of the dramatic and sensational on the part of our literary authorities, his personal life was very much as those writers have portrayed it. But a column set up by the inhabitants of the provincial city of Mogontiacum (Mainz or Mayence) in Roman Germany, to the honour of Jupiter Best and Greatest and for the safety of the Emperor Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus, gives another side of the picture. The shaft and double plinth of this column were carved with

¹ E. Strong, "La scultura romana," II., pp. 192, 193, figs. 109, 110.

² "Paneg," 80.

twenty-eight figures in relief representing Nero and a whole galaxy of deities, while a bronze statue of Jupiter crowned the whole.¹ Let us just consider the significance of the distinguished company of which the Emperor Nero forms the centre. Immediately above him are the great gods of the Roman nation, Jupiter Optimus Maximus crowning the column, and his consort, Juno Regina. Immediately below Nero are Peace, Ceres, the symbol of prosperity, and Victory, the champion of civilization. On a line with him are the Latin deities of fertility, Bacchus and the Lares; and others of a similar class—Juno Sancta, Vesta, the life-giving fire, Venus and Diana—are close at hand. Here, too, are the great powers of nature, Sol, Luna, Neptunus and Volcanus, who co-operate with Rome for the welfare of the world. Mars, the warrior goddess Roma, and Virtus stand for the armies of Rome that keep barbarism at bay. Castor and Pollux, Apollo and Hercules are the great benefactors of mankind; while Mercurius and Maia, Minerva and Fortuna and Jupiter (who occurs again upon the lower plinth) are the guardians and watchers over the Roman state. Nero himself is not quite a full-blown god, for he is offering sacrifice; but it is clear from the character of the personages by whom he is surrounded that he is regarded as fit company for deities, as the divine bestower of prosperity and peace. It is, indeed, abundantly clear from all sources that, despite court intrigues and scandals and the personal vagaries of the Princeps, the Empire as a whole flourished and prospered exceedingly under Neronian rule: to Italians and provincials alike Nero, officially, represented good government and security. Are we, then, really justified in regarding as pure irony, as a "monstrous abuse of language"² the inscription on a Greek coin of Nero's reign which hails the Emperor as *σωτήρ τῆς οἰκουμένης*, "saviour of the world"?³ Is it not this self-same ability to distinguish between the man and his office which enables Catholics to hail Alexander VI., without difficulty or insincerity, as Vicar of Christ?

Finally, the divinized Emperor was to the Roman Empire what the Papacy is to the Church, the centre of unity. "The Roman Empire found in the deification of its ruler a cohesive principle . . . a common centre of personal attachment and

¹ For a restoration of the Column see A. B. Cook, "Zeus," II., Pl. iv.: the extant portions of the original are in the Mainz Museum.

² Fiddes, "The Beginnings of Caesar-Worship," p. 6.

³ Eckhel, "Doctrina Nummorum Veterum," vi. 278.

loyalty." ¹ Why did the Roman authorities insist so emphatically upon conformity to Emperor-worship? Because, as has already been said, it had become the hall-mark of loyalty to the authority and power of Rome, of which the Emperor was the representative, the embodiment in human form of a force, moral and spiritual, as well as political, that seemed something more than human. The Empire was, of course, far more than the Empire of Rome: it was oecumenical: it comprised, in theory, at any rate, the whole *οἰκουμένη*, the whole inhabited or civilized world. We call that great world-state the *Roman* Empire because Rome was its head and heart, the centre of its common life. We call the personalization of that world-state the *Roman* Emperor, not because he was necessarily Roman, or even Italian, by birth—Trajan and Hadrian, for example, were Spaniards, Septimius Severus was an African, not because they cared more particularly for the city of Rome and spent all their time there—Hadrian, for instance, was far more interested in the provinces than in Rome and Italy, and spent a large part of his reign in touring the Empire—but because Rome was their headquarters and the centre of their Empire's administration. Similarly, though on a totally different, a divine, basis, obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the hall-mark of loyalty to the Catholic Church because he is the head and representative of the oecumenical, world-wide Church, which is not, as we know, the "Church of Rome," or even, strictly speaking, "Roman Catholic," but Catholic and Roman, the Church of the world with Rome as her centre of unity.

We have now claimed for the Imperial cult a share in the *praeparatio Evangelii*. With the triumph of the Gospel in the Empire, Emperor-worship, properly speaking, passed away. But the "Imperial idea," which this worship had externalized, did not pass with it. It is true that the Holy Roman Empire, co-existing side by side with the Catholic Church, which was Dante's ideal in the *De Monarchia* (for he discerned that it is not the empire, but the national state, which is the Church's foe), was from the first, perhaps, a shadow and a dream. For Protestants, no doubt, "the Reformation, in which the lay state . . . asserted . . . the supremacy of its king over all persons and in all causes as well ecclesiastical as temporal, marks the final defeat and disappearance of the conception of the Roman Empire." ² But

¹ E. Barker, "Legacy of Rome," p. 48.

² E. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

in the theocratic, œcumenical Catholic Church the Roman Empire, transformed and spiritualized, knows neither disappearance nor defeat. In the Sixth Book of the *Æneid*, Virgil, poet and apostle of the Roman Empire, makes Anchises in Hades prophesy to Æneas of the mission of Rome in the world, and his prophecy closes with the famous lines :

"Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
(hæ tibi erunt artes) pacique imponere morem,
parcere subiectis et debellare superbos."

(Do thou, O Roman, remember to rule the peoples by thine Empire (these shall be thine arts), to set on peace its feature, to spare the humbled and reduce the proud.)' Apply these phrases to the Catholic Church and we have a not inaccurate, if incomplete, description of her mission in the world—in our modern world, which seeks at Geneva a new international empire to curb nationalism, and to which Rome has proclaimed the Feast of Christ the King. As Dr. Mackail points out, in Virgil's use of the word *Romanus*, "the mission, the task, the glory of Rome, of the Roman people, are thought of and spoken of as a single continuous personality." * The word is applied to Æneas, but it is of the divine Augustus, who, as the incarnation of Rome, was to be one continuous personality with his successors on the throne of the Cæsars, that Virgil is thinking. And just as in the Church Virgil's dream of a spiritual Roman Empire was destined to find its fulfilment, so we may use the word *Romanus* of the occupant of another throne, a throne on which the occupant sits, not by his own right, but as Christ's Vicar, one continuous personality from Peter to Pius and to the end of time.

The Imperial cult had to die in the Church that it might, in a new sense, live in the Church again. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die first." "Unless the grain of wheat falling into the ground die, itself remaineth alone. But if it die it bringeth forth much fruit."

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

* vv. 851—853.

* *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

JEANNE D'ARC : PATRON OF PEASANTS

FROISSART and other Chroniclers of the Middle Ages leave almost completely out of sight that large body of people on whose labours as tillers of the soil the whole community depended. In two ways, and those only indirect, is its presence indicated. We read of the equipment of armies the provisioning of which must have taken toll of the fields to an extent which demanded a very considerable agricultural population. Especially is it necessary to infer the existence of such a population when one considers that a large proportion of the fighters had been withdrawn from the soil, thus increasing the number of consumers while reducing that of the producers. The means we possess to-day of preserving food were unknown and the commissariat during, say, the Hundred Years' War must have depended on harvests recently gathered. A more terrible reminder of these humble rural folk is given in the Chroniclers' constant reference to pillage. Armies depended not only on the supplies brought from home but also on the crops and cattle of the enemy's country. And where these were not needed or were of a character which prevented them from being carried away, they were frequently destroyed in order to starve out the opposing force. In reading of the invasions and counter-invasions of English and Scots, one wonders that anything was left to steal or burn. The story of these campaigns suggests a large and active peasantry.

But, in this and in other cases, it is a suggestion only. The reader must depend on his own inferences. All he is allowed actually to see are the waving pennons and glittering armour which give a momentary touch of colour to the countryside. When there is flashed on to the screen of history the picture of charging knights we catch no glimpse of the harvests they trampled into the mire. When they move on to fresh exploits, we move with them and thus miss the aftermath of battle—peasants returning to their ruined homes and fields.

English history of course relates the Peasant Insurrection of 1381 when those who had provided the means for the glitter of feudal pageantry forced themselves to the front of

the stage. The story is a sorry one of indiscipline on the one hand and of broken pledges on the other. The thing missed fire. It was mismanaged on both sides and a great opportunity was lost, with disastrous consequences in the succeeding centuries. Neither the nobility of the time nor the Lollards had the inspiration that was necessary to put things right. Only one man seems to have looked at the crisis sanely, and he was a man of words rather than of action. William Langland invoked Piers Plowman—the People's Christ—to arbitrate, but the balanced judgment of his disordered poem fell on deaf ears. The cottagers of England never again figure so conspicuously in our "island story." The risings of 1830 came too late and lacked the leadership that might have made them effective. Cobbett's truculent championship was against odds that were overwhelming. Thereafter, the peasantry of Great Britain disappears in a cloud of factory smoke.

There were upheavals similar to that of 1381 on the Continent. There as here, however, they came to nothing. The Peasants' War of the sixteenth century did but add another tragedy to the long story of agrarian revolt. It is France which supplies the most arresting protest against the obscuration of the Peasant. But it took a form so strange, so contrary to all the usual methods of class movements, and the chief actors in the drama, including the chief Actor herself, were so entirely unconscious of the part they were playing that its significance has been missed. It has been discussed in the light of ecclesiastical or nationalist issues while its relation to social history is generally overlooked. There is abundance of excuse for this. It is only the events of the present day which have given it the interpretation for which it seems to have been waiting.

St. Joan's ostensible mission was to deliver her country from the invading English and secure the coronation of the Dauphin. That was the task to which her "Voices" called her. The marvellousness of her success is known to all. Even if it had been achieved by one experienced in warfare it would have been wonderful, but the fact that it was achieved by such as she makes its supernatural character clear. When we say "such as she," it is not her sex that we have chiefly in mind. Women noted for military prowess were not unknown in the Middle Ages. To mention only one case, Froissart tells us of how the Countess of Montfort,

in her lord's absence, defended his possessions against besiegers. "On every attack," we read, "the Countess, who had herself clothed in armour, and was mounted on a war-horse, galloped up and down the streets entreating and encouraging the inhabitants to make a brave resistance; at her orders the ladies and other women carried the paving stones of the streets to the ramparts, and threw them on the enemy. She also had pots of quicklime brought to her for the same purpose." The story of how Queen Philippa, while her husband, Edward III., was in France, met and defeated the Scots at Neville's Cross is too well known to be repeated. But these dames belonged to the ruling class. They carried the prestige of their husbands' names and were regarded as legitimately representing the absent lords' authority. It was different when a girl of humble rank, with no knowledge of warfare, emerged suddenly from her peasant state to control armies and win unheard-of victories. It was contrary to all precedent. If there was one thing on which Feudalism was firm it was in its insistence—save in the ecclesiastical sphere—on caste. Malory indeed tells the story of the scullion who became a knight, but Sir Gareth, known as Beaumains, was of high lineage and did but enter Arthur's Court incognito. We do not get nearer than that in the breaking down of social barriers. Joan was a portent for whom the code of Chivalry made no provision.

This view of the matter makes it easier to understand the treatment she received. It is not so difficult to comprehend the English attitude, though even there we find a peculiar hatred not at all characteristic of the feeling of the conquered for the conqueror. The king or knight who had been overcome did not lack, if he deserved it, the tribute of the victor and reciprocated the courtesies he received; the relationship was not unlike that between two modern, record-breaking rivals who are photographed, after the contest, shaking hands. But the English never felt like that about Joan. The legend of her witchcraft was still strong enough at the close of the sixteenth century to colour deeply the representation of her in Shakespeare's "Henry VI." The French desertion of their Deliverer takes some explanation. It might be said that knight-errants pledged to rescue distressed damsels were non-plussed when the distressed damsel rescued *them*. That was a contingency on which they had not reckoned, but it does not wholly account for the fact

that the King's party acted in so unchivalrous a manner towards her, neither attempting a rescue nor offering any ransom for her release. No doubt it was galling to owe their triumph to a woman and to see her achieve what they with all their experience had failed to achieve. But it was even more humiliating to be in the debt of a peasant-girl. A member of that obscure class whose function it was to provide the means for their brilliant exploits had actually eclipsed them in their own chosen and exclusive field. Was there a subconscious feeling that somehow the nobility's supposed monopoly of the warlike virtues had been challenged and that it could never again impose belief with the same assurance? Did the French King and his associates feel as might some coterie of literary snobs when a rural poet is heard to out-sing them all? The comparison is not very illuminating, for literature is happily free, as a rule, from social prejudices; feudalism, on the other hand, was based on distinctions of rank.

That feudalism was now in decline. New forces were at work in the world which would dissolve it. Cervantes' satire would administer its death-blow. But no satire could be more scathing than history itself had been. The treatment its representatives meted out to the Maid of Orleans exposed once for all the hollowness of their claims to true chivalry of feeling. They failed in the very sphere in which they were supposed to excel. They are pilloried in this crucial affair as having been the most unchivalrous of men. Their code broke down when it encountered the supernaturally inspired peasant girl of Domremy. Churchmen and doctors also failed in their dealings with her, but they were comparatively unaffected by the question of social status, and their cruelly unjust inquisition concerns us less here than the class prejudices which united the French and English nobility.

But if St. Joan exposed the inner decay of the feudal aristocracy, she also brought her own class into proud prominence. Supernatural graces transfigure but do not destroy the natural virtues, as the sunlight glorifies the landscape on which it falls. Neither the radiance of the saint nor the alien rôle she was called upon to play obscured the characteristics due to her humble origin. It is her glory that, through all the stirring and tragic scenes of her public life, she remained the cottar's daughter. Amid the press of armed men or facing learned jurists and parrying their thrusts, she is still

the same girl who sickled the harvest on her father's lot. The homeliness of her speech knows no affectation. She is as honest as the soil on which she had laboured. The freshness of the countryside remains with her to the end, made only more apparent by the finery of the Court and the sophistry of her judges. She carries the fragrance of the earth with her. She is plain, simple, loyal, God-fearing—a glorified peasant.

It was her thought to fight the battle of her nation rather than of her class. She was no noisy agitator. She and her folk had suffered from marauding soldiery, but these experiences, though they showed her the sinister side of dynastic quarrels and the wrongs under which her fellow-peasants suffered, left her acquiescence in the existing social system unaffected. It is not in her own mind that we discover the larger mission on which, by divine guidance, she was engaged. She was one of those who build better than they know. Great social changes were at hand and God set before western Christendom a saintly representative of that class which it would be for its social welfare to recognize. That all might see her and correct their judgment of her class, He lifted up to proud eminence a daughter of the despised people.

Nor could Cauchon and Charles entirely frustrate the divine purpose. She saved France in their own day from its military enemies, but that is not all. Is there no connection between the fact that France owes its political salvation to St. Joan and that other fact, which has told so heavily in its favour in the present crisis, that it has retained amid all vicissitudes its peasant basis? While the neighbouring nation across the Channel whose agrarians were represented in the day of their distress by John Ball, Wat Tyler and Jack Straw is shaken to its foundations, the people who gave birth to Jeanne D'Arc have learned once more the stabilizing value of those workers so faithfully pictured in Millet's "Angelus." Between the Maid of Orleans and the recovery of the franc there may seem, at first sight, little relation. But the economist here comes to the aid of the hagiographer. He tells us that it is the existence of a large class of small farmers producing for themselves and their immediate neighbours which is enabling France to weather the storm. A second time in her history that country owes her salvation to the peasant. And some will say it is the same Peasant in both cases, that the survival of this essential element in the

community and the service it has rendered in these days are but consequences of St. Joan's intercession for her fellow-workers and of the moral effect which her personality has had upon her nation.

But if that be so, her Mission is not yet concluded. It extends to our entire civilization. The actual quarrel in which she was involved does not strike us to-day as being of that all-important character which calls for divine intervention. The feuds of monarchs contending for territory leave us cold. The interest in them is national rather than universal. At a time when the question has arisen whether our Christian civilization itself can survive, wars between rival representatives of Christendom have shrunk in significance. Still less does the soldier's calling retain its former glory; that glory has been buried in the mud and blood of the trenches. There is a danger therefore that St. Joan's fame might suffer by the decline of interest in those temporal affairs in which she was concerned. It is essential that her saintliness be related to matters more relevant to our own and succeeding ages and that a truer proportion be established between the supernatural powers she wielded and the mission it was her part to fulfil. Her story needs to be framed in a larger and more permanent setting. The suggestions made may hint at the larger truth concerning her, for the cause of the class she represented is no ephemeral thing. On the physical basis provided by the agriculturalist the entire community rests and must always rest. Due recognition of the service he renders is one of the marks of a soundly established society. Lack of such recognition is sure presage of disaster. Never was that truth more evident than it is to-day. The sins of the Industrial Revolution are at last finding us out. If the nemesis they have brought upon us is not to be fatal, the priest and the peasant must be given due honour. Hence the relevancy of one who was both saint and peasant. Her intercession was never more necessary. We may see her, in shining armour of supernatural beauty, contending against the forces which would drive or bribe the people from the fields or hinder their return thereto. May she reveal to the world once again the character of those simple folk whose acres are deserted and with whose cottages modern industrialism has dealt as once feudal armies dealt with the homes of the mediæval poor!

STANLEY B. JAMES.

WILLEM HUBERT NOLENS

THE late Monsignor Nolens, like Monsignor Seipel of Austria and other ecclesiastical statesmen who have come into prominence since the war, was a shining example of the compatibility of the priestly profession with distinguished public service. Of old, ecclesiastics became statesmen because they alone were highly educated; nowadays, priests enter political life as an indirect result of their zeal for social improvement, since under that aspect their work does not cease to be directly religious. The general prohibition against clerics taking up lay pursuits does not apply to activities which have for object the application of moral principles to industrial life. Of such activities Mgr. Nolens was an exponent from his youth. A writer in a Dutch newspaper has described his life as one "devoted to religion and social betterment," for with his peculiar gifts it could scarcely be otherwise than that the one should be expressed in terms of the other, when he encountered the vast social problems which have been created by the Industrial Revolution and the intervention of the State in commerce. While he had the fatherly spirit of the priest, and a great love of Mother Church which showed itself very often in care for Her external decoration, his mind was that of the lawyer and politician, or, more correctly, of the statesman. This was to be seen in his early studies and work, and when, at the age of thirty, he took his degree of Doctor of Laws at the State University of Utrecht (there was no Catholic University in Holland at that time), he chose as the subject of his thesis that of "The Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas on Law." Six years prior to this and before undertaking his advanced theological studies he had passed his examination as a "Master in Law" which entitled him, had he desired it, to practise at the Dutch Bar, where it is almost certain he would have made a great name for himself. Personal advancement, however, was the last thing he considered, or rather he never considered it at all; his desire was to work for the coming of the Kingdom of Christ, and his method of doing this work was simply the practical application to national and international politics of Christian principles.

Born on September 7, 1860, at the little manufacturing town of Venlo in the Limburg mining area, his sympathies remained throughout his life with those who, in these grim surroundings, have to struggle to earn a bare competence. Here his schooldays were passed and at 19 years of age he went on to the lower seminary at Rolduc, where are to be found the State coal mines of Holland, bordering on the German mining district of the Ruhr. A year here, then three years at Utrecht, and he was sent to the seminary at Roermond to complete his studies for the priesthood, being ordained on March 25, 1887.

A year later he was appointed professor at Rolduc, where his subjects were those of moral philosophy and sociology. This latter subject was an entirely new one at the time for Dutch seminaries, and there were no text-books available on the subject. Consequently his lessons were prepared in detail by himself, with illustrations from newspapers and books in many languages and still more from the record of his own experience and that of his colleagues. Naturally the "Rerum Novarum" when it was issued three years after his appointment, and other encyclicals bearing on the subject of social life were carefully studied with a particular view to their practical application to the problems of the day and the interests of his beloved mine- and factory-workers. At this juncture, just as in his later and wider surroundings, Nolens had an outward appearance and manner that suggested the unsympathetic martinet. Martinet he may have been, but an unsympathetic one he certainly was not. Students of 18 and 20 years do not give their affection to an unsympathetic character, and Dr. Nolens, during the whole of his career as a teacher and professor, won a very real affection from his pupils. One thing that probably helped to make him sympathetic and popular with boys was his utter lack of any sentimentalism and his strong, practical common sense. A single incident will illustrate this. Just as other teachers he was occasionally made the butt of misplaced humour on the part of his pupils. Once one of the boys in his class had caught a little mouse, and arranged with his fellow-students to set it free in the middle of the lesson. This was done. The effect was not what had been hoped and expected. Without showing any anger or mental disturbance Dr. Nolens, noticing that the whole class seemed to be in the plot, quietly gathered up his papers and saying with calm dignity—"And

now, boys, you must do the rest without me," left the room. A moment later, however, appeared the Prefect (known by the students as the "Champieter" or "Garde Champêtre") and imposed a penalty of a week's confinement to the grounds, a week without tobacco, besides sundry impositions. Nevertheless, when Dr. Nolens appeared before his class a week later he was received with clapping and cheers of a character seldom accorded to the most popular teachers. Nolens himself, naturally pleased, only said "No ovations, boys; last week we had reached lesson No. 30, section Political Economy. We will now go on from there." No more tricks of this kind were ever played on Dr. Nolens.

During this time he was also teaching, in the local High School for Boys, general history, political economy and religion. In this connection, it may be recalled that although Holland is nominally, and so far as the majority of its inhabitants are concerned, is actually a Protestant country, the provinces of Limburg and North Brabant are almost entirely Catholic, and even in other parts of the country, thanks to the educational system which Dr. Nolens himself was to do much to develop, it is no uncommon thing to find priests among the teachers in both higher and lower-grade schools. One result, traceable directly and indirectly to his teaching in these two institutions, was the strengthening of a beneficent labour-movement in the diocese of Roermond, a movement that worked for the material as well as the spiritual welfare of the people, without looking for inspiration to so-called liberal or socialistic ideas. And he did this with a simplicity, a love of both his pupils and his subjects, a keen but quiet sense of humour and a power of illustration that foreshadowed in some measure the powerful effect of his rare speeches as a statesman. Consciously and unconsciously he was preparing in a number of ways for his future position.

A great book-lover, he early began the formation of what became a considerable library. One of the subjects to which a corner of such library was devoted was that of the history of the abbey and religious life of the little town of Rolduc. In studying this history, he was inevitably drawn into that of the coal-mining industry which for nearly a century had been a very important one to the district. He early saw the difficulties under which both owners and workers carry on their business and the peculiar temptations to oppression and carelessness of human life on the one side and to insub-

ordination and rough disregard for others' property on the other which beset them. At first, he could only teach by word and example the duty and blessedness of charity, but later he was to have an opportunity of putting into practice a scheme that should, at least to some extent, remove some of these difficulties and temptations. While he was still a young professor the Seminary was visited by Dr. Herman Schaepman, the man who did more than any other individual to organize ecclesiastical matters in Holland and to bring about a proper relation between these and national politics, and by Dr. Kuyper, a noble and conscientious Protestant with whom the then Catholic leader worked so amicably in all matters in which it was possible for them to collaborate. Officially it was not so, but actually there is little doubt that this visit had reference to the future of the young priest who was making a reputation as a publicist and an authority of weight on social and industrial problems, both in the local papers and in Catholic periodicals.

In November 1896 he was elected member of the Second Chamber of the States General for his native district of Venlo. Then as always a man who could afford to wait and observe, for he meant his words to have behind them the force which comes from complete knowledge and to issue in action, he attended regularly all the meetings of the Chamber for nearly a year before making his maiden speech. This he did on All Saints' Day, 1897, taking for his inspiration the teaching of "*Rerum Novarum*." In this speech, although a comparatively young and untried politician, he laid the foundations of the work of the Catholic Party in Holland and showed to all who had the will to see it why such Party was necessary and for what it should stand. To him then as later the Catholic Party was not one that represented some local or passing policy; it was not an organization for protecting the material interests of the Church, though it might do that incidentally, or for advancing to political power a group of internationalists whose centre was at Rome. Professed objects such as these he recognized as dangers to which almost necessarily a political party is exposed, and, whenever he saw such dangers arising, he was one of the first and most active in combating them. Especially in Holland, where it is as "respectable" to be Catholic as in England it is to belong to the State Church or to the Wesleyan body, are these dangers ever present. The one

reason in the eyes of Nolens for the existence of a Catholic Party with representatives in parliament was that of Christianizing both politics and industry, and whatever was said or done by that Party, whatever measures received its support or whatever criticism of, or opposition to, others it exercised, was, under his guidance, based solely on this consideration.

His career after this caused him to be regarded by many entirely and essentially as a statesman. Statesman and politician he certainly was, but only incidentally. Nolehs was before all and above all a priest and a teacher, alike by calling and choice, and whatever political work he did was merely a means of drawing his own nation and the world in general nearer to God. Regular in his attendance at the sittings of the Chamber he managed, thanks to his enormous capacity for work, to travel between The Hague and Rolduc with sufficient frequency to maintain an intimate contact with his pupils and fellow-professors at the Seminary for fifteen years after his election. Subsequently increase of work for the nation made his tenure of the professorship too great a tax on his time and strength, and he accepted a post as Professor of Law, with particular reference to Labour, at the Municipal University of Amsterdam. Lighter academic work and shorter journeys enabled him to continue in actual work as a teacher until September 1925. Direct pastoral duties he had not undertaken since October 1909, having been discharged from these at his own request.

Considering his enthusiasm for his priestly and academic offices it may well be asked why he should have chosen a political career. The answer in short is that he knew his own powers and limitations and realized that, in close touch with affairs and with those that directed them, his teaching would reach a wider area than would have been the case had he remained in the school, the parish or even as head of a diocese. He might have become Rector of a large parish, President of a Seminary, even Bishop of a diocese; but in any of these capacities, he could not have exercised his peculiar powers as freely as he could in the purely political sphere, where he could take an active part in the making and propagation of salutary laws.

Among the laws for which he was in part personally responsible was that which made possible the active ownership by the State of some of the coal mines in his beloved

Limburg. His power of initiative, his persistence and his earnestness were, in effect, the cause of one of the most successful State-enterprises of our time; successful that is, in the fullest sense of the term and not merely as a financial undertaking. When first he brought the idea forward among his fellow deputies, he was opposed, flouted, sneered at. Why should Holland bother about wretched mines and mine-workers in a remote corner of the country, when the Indies lay ripe for the harvest of their riches, already being garnered more copiously than had fallen to the lot of any other nation? One man, however, had the same foresight, the same initiative, as himself, combined with a personality that balanced his own by its contrast. This was Dr. C. Lely, known the world over as the man who put into operation the draining of the Zuyder Zee. On June 24, 1901, the proposed mining law was passed, and ever since, by co-operation between the State and the private owners of adjoining mines, under the leadership and personal driving-force of Nolens, the lot of the miners has grown steadily brighter, whilst reasonable profits are sometimes earned even when other similar undertakings are suffering loss.

It is interesting to note that this achievement of a priest born in the district, was in effect a continuation of the work of the monks of former days. In the eighteenth century the mines of South Limburg were first opened under the direction of the Abbey of Rolduc. The earliest record of the number of workers employed dates from 1780, when there were 800. Shortly after this, the local authorities took over the mines with the result that in 1845 there were only 200 workers employed, and people talked of the South Limburg mines with a sneer or a gesture of despair. To-day there are nearly 40,000 workers, while the social conditions are good and the moral standard high. Nolens was one of the founders, in 1901, of the mineworkers' federation and remained the chief adviser to that federation, both in temporal and spiritual matters, until 1909. His appointment in that year as Professor at Amsterdam and Curator of the Technical School at Delft, and his growing engagements in connection with his parliamentary duties, caused him to resign, but he never lost touch with the miners and constantly worked in their material and moral interests.

All this was a preparation for his subsequent work as member of the board of Conciliation, of the Commission

of Enquiry into Unemployment and of other similar bodies, and as Chairman of the Board of the States Mines and of the Supreme Labour Council, as well as for his later International work. This last started with the first Official International Labour Conference at Washington in 1918, in which year he had already refused to act as Prime Minister, or to accept any office in the Cabinet. He was sent out as delegate by his friend, Dr. P. J. M. Aalberse, the Minister of Labour in the first Ruys de Beerenbrouck government (the present government of the Netherlands being the third under that great Catholic Statesman). Making his work the "intention" of his daily Mass, he was not afraid to speak out very plainly at the meetings on behalf of what he considered was the cause of righteousness. One of his speeches on the subject of the 8-hours day aroused considerable opposition and sensation, but it was to no small degree his work which caused the Washington Convention regarding the hours of labour, which may be regarded as the foundation of all international Labour betterment, to be passed by the overwhelming majority of 83 to 2. Year after year he attended the various Labour Conferences and in 1926 was elected President of the Labour Commission at Geneva. This brought tributes from the most unexpected quarters and of a character equally unexpected. "To have known Mgr. Nolens," said an English statesman, "is itself a great education," while not only was his candidature supported by the Catholic members and by those whose views were what is known as on the "Right," but also, with equal enthusiasm, by the Socialist Mertens and his colleagues. The speech of the Socialist leader in which he stated that Nolens had "often pointed out to us the right way" was surely as high a tribute as could be paid to the missionary tact of one whose programme was based entirely on the "*Rerum Novarum*."

One other work of combined national and international significance was his mission in 1915 to the Vatican in connection with the restoration of diplomatic relations between Holland and the Holy See. His work in this case was a complete success, though, alas, he lived to see it spoilt, a few years later, by fanatical anti-Catholics who managed to win a narrow majority in favour of the withdrawal of the necessary financial support for a Minister. Fortunately for Holland the authorities at the Vatican decided that the removal of the Dutch Minister from the Vatican did not neces-

sarily entail the removal of the Internuncio from The Hague, and Mgr. Schioppa (who has the personal title of Nuncio) who has for the past six years done excellent work as diplomat and as unofficial assistant to the Dutch episcopate, still continues that work. One direct result of Dr. Nolens's visit to the Vatican was that, a few months later, he was appointed a Protonotary Apostolic.

With all his personal success, with his many ecclesiastical and civil distinctions, Mgr. Nolens always remained the humble worker who preferred his own home to the brilliance of the outside world, and who went like any other parishioner to his parish priest for spiritual assistance rather than to any of the dignitaries with whom his work brought him into contact. It was his parish priest, Pastor L. H. J. Beyssens, who brought him the last sacraments and helped him, as in his office of Rector of a busy and poverty-stricken parish, he daily helps many others, to "learn the science of how to die." Father Beyssens has given a description of Monsignor Nolens's death-bed that shows how typical this was of his whole life. With so many interests and so many tasks apparently uncompleted the great statesman naturally found it difficult to prepare to leave them, but "at the last he was content and completely submissive to God's holy will." "Monsignor read and meditated. The last days were physically very difficult, but Monsignor hid his great pain. He would not speak about it, although he was suffering intensely." As often happens with a person of powerful physique the actual death struggle was a severe one, and the end came suddenly. Sometime before he died he had decided to place his resignation of the many national posts which he held in the hands of the Queen, retaining only one of the many. This post was that of the Chairmanship of the Mine Board. From the earliest days of his priesthood he had been the miners' and mine owners' priest, and in this function he would continue to the end. This was his life's work and he would not lay it down until his Master called him.

HERBERT ANTCLIFFE.

THE RE-BIRTH OF HEBREW

THE almost miraculous revival of Hebrew in Palestine during the last twenty years sets one wondering to what extent it ever completely died out as a national language. We all credit Moses, David and Isaiah with having used Hebrew as their mother-tongue, and Our Lord with having conversed in a Hebrew dialect called Aramaic. We know also that the Talmud was composed in one or other of these two kindred languages. And of course it is for Jews, as Latin is for us, the language of the liturgy. It is also common knowledge that every Jewish boy is expected to pick up a fair smattering of the "lashon hakiddush" (sacred tongue). Evening schools are provided for those who receive their education where Hebrew is not taught. It is also just possible that one or other of us may have read that the famous "Gaon of Vilna," Elijah ben Solomon, conversed almost entirely in that language. Beyond such fragments it is unwise to expect to find any further information at all definite or reliable in general circulation.

It is in the hope of illustrating the difference between past and modern linguistic conditions in the Land of Israel that this article is written. The writer, who can claim no first-hand acquaintance with Hebrew literature in the original, is indebted for his information mainly to a book by Dr. Shalom Spiegel of the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, called "Hebrew Reborn."

Whilst preparing the approach to our enquiry, it may be well to remark that Ibn Gabirol, Jehuda haLevi and Maimonides (eleventh and twelfth centuries) wrote for the most part in Arabic, a language which influenced Hebrew to a considerable degree both in its vocabulary and in its syntax; but Gershon, Albo and Delmedigo (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) wrote in the "mamma lashon" (mother tongue). What may be styled modern Hebrew literature dates from circa 1743, or in other words from the Jewish Renaissance. This is spoken of as the Haskala (Enlightenment) from the word "sekhel" (reason). Moses Luzatto, of a distinguished Paduan family, is honoured as the herald of this movement in the realm of belles-lettres. Born in 1707, his first attempt at drama was an imitation of Guarini's

"Pastor Fido." There is an undercurrent of Kabbalistic feeling in his writings.

Jews in the mid-eighteenth century were awakening from their mediæval slumbers. Moses Mendelssohn (1729—1786), the grandfather of the musical composer, regarded as a second "liberator," was appealing in the catholic language of Jewry, to all the scattered children of Israel to avail themselves of all the opportunities for acquiring general, even gentile, education. They were being exhorted from Berlin, the headquarters of the Haskala, to be Jews in religion but Germans, Russians or Poles in culture and outlook on life. This was a real revolution, a complete setting aside of the old Ghetto tradition of regarding all "goyish" civilization with suspicion, not unmixed with contempt. Many of those who favoured the movement, known as "maskelim," were tainted with the prevalent rationalism. Many—Heine professes to have been one—went through the form of baptism with more or less insincerity regarding it as a passport to social success. Grätz, probably exaggerating, states that within three decades half of the Berlin Jewish community "went over to the Church." It was no doubt desperately difficult to steer a safe course between the rocks of mediævalism and the shoals of modernism. It is significant that the word for "German" in Yiddish—Deitch—came to be a synonym for a heretic.

Let us pass to the Haskala in the more orthodox countries further east. Nachman Krochmal (1785—1840), a Galician, was a sage of such magnitude that he was not easily affected by surface influences. He served as a link between the old Talmudism and the new scientific spirit. He would not admit that there was any real antagonism, whereas Samuel David Luzatto (1800—1865) crossed swords with him, claiming that science and religion are necessarily at variance because, although both true, each belongs to a different category.

For the first two or three generations the Maskelim writers retained much of the rhetorical, if not bombastic, style which had characterized the later Hebrew literature in the Middle Ages. Not only was the vocabulary almost entirely biblical but their writings were for the most part—to quote the Jewish Encyclopædia, to some of whose articles we are indebted for help—"tessellated" with passages culled from the pages of the Old Testament. This form of artificial com-

position is called "melizah." It was not till the nineteenth century was well started that it fell into disrepute.

The Russian Haskala—neither word is to be taken too strictly—followed the German after a respectful interval and on somewhat different lines. Its object was to rouse Jews from torpor and stimulate them to pull their weight in the social life of the country. Most of its literary output combated the ideas imbibed in "yeshibas" (rabbinical colleges). Several of the Russian Maskelim, not satisfied with this attempt at emancipating their own people, offered themselves as leaders to the downtrodden serfs. They were foremost, in the favourable days of Alexander I. and of Nicholas I., in proclaiming the advantages and dignity of agricultural labour. Isaac Baer Levinsohn of Volhynia (1788—1860) bears, without much claim, the title of the Russian Mendelssohn. Abraham Mapu (1808—1860) must be mentioned as the creator of the Hebrew novel. Sir Hall Caine, recently dead, told a friend of his that the foundation of all his romances was to be found in the Bible, the collection of the finest stories in the world: Mapu openly chose his subjects from that inexhaustible storehouse. But he brings it all up to date and indulges in caustic wit in describing the inmates of Idlers' Town, Dunce Town and Beggars' Town. He does not spare the foibles of his own folk. Joshua Leb Gordon is sometimes dubbed the poet laureate of this group of Russo-Jewish litterateurs. A Scottish reader might not unreasonably resent this apparent misappropriation of a Highland name; but there is no ground for this: it appears to be a Russian name identical in form. Maybe some enterprising Scot introduced it in the days of Peter the Great; at any rate several Jews in those parts have borne it with distinction. This bearer of it has left behind him a volume of fine lyrical verse, as also the reputation which he specially aimed at, of being a mighty hard hitter. He is the author of the slogan: "Be a man abroad, a Jew in thy tent, a brother to thy countrymen and a servant to thy king." He charges even ancient Judaism with having been disloyal to the soil and therefore doomed to fail. After his death, in great part owing to external causes—pogroms and suchlike miseries—the cause he had so much at heart ended in disillusionment, if not despair. He himself had become almost a nihilist.

No account of this period can omit the honoured name of Perez Smolenskin. Born in 1842 he went through an

orthodox training for the rabbinate on the "taeg" system. Taeg is the Yiddish for "days" and stands for the arrangement by which an impecunious student was boarded out on benevolent neighbours for the different days of the week. Those who have read any of the charming sketches of Jewish life by those brilliant brothers Jean and Jérôme Tharaud will be able to supply the atmosphere of such seminary life. His span was short but in it he accomplished a great work. He started and established a magazine to which he gave the hopeful name *HaShachar* (the Dawn) and, with it as a banner, ushered in a new era that was to culminate in Zionism. *HaShachar* denounced Mendelssohn and all his methods and admirers in all the Hebrew moods and tenses, holding him responsible for the manifold desertions in Central Europe. It was mainly in his novels that he belaboured the fanatics, as he deemed them, nearer home. The best sellers of these are "*Hattoeh bedarche hachayim*" (As-tray in the Paths of Life) and "*Keburath Chabor*" (The Burial of a Donkey). '*Am 'Olam* (The Eternal People) retains its renown as a masterly treatise. One of Smolenskin's strong points is that love for one's own people is by no means incompatible with universal human sympathies. He advocated moderate Rabbinism, a religion stripped of that mystic and emotional element which he had come up against in the Chassidic coteries. In this way he roped in many of those who had little, if any, faith in Judaism properly so called. He tended to give nationalism precedence over religion.

Micah Joseph Berditchewski, born in 1865, went further and won for himself the sobriquet of "Heretic." He was a Ukrainian, and poverty and misfortunes—his father is said to have been killed by Petlura—made him an intellectual rebel on the lines of Nietzsche. Early in life he had become a "mithnagged" (an opponent of the Chassidim). Spiegel describes him as a "storm incarnate" and so we may infer that he was, like several of his fellows, eminently temperamental. He admired the strong man and pooh-poohed piety. Joshua and Gerizim were more to his liking than Moses and Sinai. For all that, at times "the vestiges of Judaism stir within his bosom" and "he feels the end of the week—the Sabbath—in his bones." Saul Tchernikovski is a kindred spirit, having the war-like Maccabees and Bar Cochba as his heroes rather than those who set an example of the passive virtues. At

other times in his zeal for valour and virility he seeks his model in the almost prehistoric age. Our author describes him as the Bard of Hebrew Paganism. "Those ancient peoples lived in To-day and To-morrow, whilst we limp after Yesterday. . . We should be the sons of our Fathers, not their coffins": this is a characteristic utterance.

Two instances are given of remarkable "casualties." J. E. Salkinson (d. 1883), son of a Hebrew poet, ended as a minister of the Presbyterian Church at Glasgow. "He translated the Gospels, Milton and Shakespeare into magnificent Hebrew. Indeed his correspondence is most instructive in showing how incredibly deep and genuine a love for Hebrew the baptized minister still had in his heart." Judah Klaczko (1825—1906) after composing a youthful volume of poems in which he pledged himself to restore the ruins of Zion, became a Catholic glorifier of the Polish folk traditions. He made his mark as a writer on historical and literary subjects in Polish, French and German.

Aaron David Gordon (1856—1922) deserves a paragraph to himself. At the age of forty-eight he left his family in Podolia and started life as an agricultural labourer in Palestine. His grave by the Jordan is indeed a sacred place. Baron de Rothschild, the patron of the Daganian settlement, from kindly motives did not wish his "chalutzim" (pioneers) to risk their lives in draining swamps. In a noble protest drawn up by one of them may be read: "We, the organized workers of Palestine, wish to share in the work with you. . . We wish to stand up to our necks in the swamps of Kabara, there to feel the travail of creation. For us no labour is too hard, of death we have no fear. . . It is our work that will hasten the 'Geulah' (redemption). . . Ours is the privilege of dying for Kabara, because we claim for ourselves the privilege of living upon it." Gordon's word and example were the inspiration of this splendid document. He had taught them that 'Avodah means both work and worship: laborare est orare. He had instilled into them a horror of parasitism and a sense of the saving influence of Earth, Sun, Wind and Rain. " 'Avodah Zarah " (Work done for us) was to be regarded by them as a form of idolatry. They were to cultivate "the blessed glow of labour."

We come now to writers who, if they are not still living, must have died in middle age. Bialik is the poet *par excellence*. He lives in Telaviv, the new suburb city adjoining

Jaffa and is still under sixty. Odessa was his home for years. Educated himself in a "yeshiba," he was as loyal to that form of training as was compatible with his artistic temperament. In one of his best known poems he glorifies the life of dedication to sacred study. But his admiration for the active life of the colonist triumphed over the old allegiance. Professor Spiegel pays him the tribute of styling him "the conscience of the Hebrew word and its supreme trustee." His fountain of song has failed of late years, but he continues to be a centre of influence.

We have now at last reached the point at which the "Choveve Zion" (Lovers of Zion) movement, with which Dr. Leo Pinsker was so intimately connected, merged into the Zionism of the famous Theodore Herzl. It was under Pinsker's influence that a daily Hebrew newspaper was started in Palestine in 1886. He is also credited with having attempted to induce Palestinian Jews to speak their ancestral tongue. Asher Ginsburg, more generally known by his pen-name Achad Ha'am (One of the People), devoted his conspicuous literary ability to the revival of the true sentiment of Jewish nationality. Unlike most of his predecessors, with the exception of Pinsker, his aim is to appeal to the intellect and so he formulates his arguments in sober, lucid, logical style, usually associated with the Latin rather than with the Hebrew mentality.

It is high time to pass to the spoken language. The dominant personality in this connection is Eliezer Ben Jehuda, born in Vilna 1858. When he died a few years ago *The Times* devoted a long notice to his romantic career. Ill health, family troubles, poverty, bitter opposition—nothing could turn him aside from his fixed purpose of making Hebrew the popular language for all Jews in Palestine. Some deny his monopoly in the success which has undoubtedly been achieved; but all admit that he played the leading part. As a youth his ardour for modern Hebrew was enkindled by reading in secret—such profane literature was contraband—a neo-Hebrew translation of Robinson Crusoe. "Daniel Deronda" also helped in his formation by inflaming his patriotism. On the voyage to Palestine he starts teaching his wife the elements of conversational Hebrew, with the solemn understanding that on arriving in that land they should speak no other language and that it should be the only language of their children. This compact was faith-

fully observed and to save the little ones from hearing either a foreign tongue or their own badly pronounced, the wife, although delicate, dispensing with a servant, did all the drudgery herself. To enable an ancient language to meet modern needs a number of words must be supplied: the first word he coined was "millon" (dictionary) and his first work was to compile one, or perhaps we should say, create. Many old-fashioned Jews condemned him for desecrating a sacred language. He held on to the outward observances of religion for some time but ultimately dropped them. The word "mibresheth" (brush) is a sample from his mint: the first and the last syllable impart the Hebrew character. Klausner, the distinguished professor of the Jerusalem University and author of the *Hebrew Life of Christ*, helped him in his work and has since commented on it.

There is always a tendency for the sake of simplification to ascribe to one man a work that was done by several. Possibly this is true in the case of Ben Jehuda. But about the result there can be no mistake: Hebrew is the mother-tongue of all the Jewish children born in Palestine during the last decade. The rising generation revels in it, and the infection spreads amongst their elders. All sorts of topics may be discussed in it from the mysteries of manure and the diseases of the mangold-wurzel to the latest achievements of the radio and the cinema. Connoisseurs tell us that the genius of the old language seems to be rising to the emergency in directing and assimilating the new additions and necessary modifications. The slogan of the "Gedud Maginne Hassafah" (Legion for the defence of the language) is "Jew, speak Hebrew." But the need for such propaganda is becoming less and less. It would be difficult to stop them from talking Hebrew now. Jokes and topical allusions can all be freely expressed in this vernacular. The schools are conducted entirely in it. Four newspapers appear daily.

Nor is this re-birth confined to Palestine: Lithuania comes next in this respect with Latvia as a good third. In all those regions where National Minority Rights are the rule, "Hebrew in Hebrew"—"Ibrit b'Ibrit"—is the practice in Jewish schools. This is true also of the evening religious classes in the leading London Talmud Torah—Redman's Road, Stepney.

May we not hope that there may be some repercussion on the study of Hebrew by Gentiles? We trust this will

become more general as the methods of teaching Hebrew become less inhuman. Learned men have seemed to conspire to keep Hebrew as their monopoly. They compose books about it calculated to kill off a large percentage of aspirants. The Jewish child used to be introduced to the alphabet by means of wooden letters that had been smeared with honey. We plead for something similar for the poor Gentile who makes his first attempt to spell out the language of the Bible. Indeed the present writer would urge the advisability in most cases of confining the novice to transliterated Hebrew until he has acquired a fair idea of what this old oriental tongue is like. The difficulty of Hebrew is to a great extent the alphabet. In Holland every secondary school receiving a grant from public money must be prepared to teach Hebrew if required. We may not unreasonably trust that the fresh breezes from the uplands of Judaea and Galilee will ere long blow away the mists of prejudice that have in the past dimmed the beauty of things Hebraic. Atticism is excellent and has served the Church as a gracious handmaid, but Hebraism has on Christians a far deeper claim.

One last word. The facts related in this article are indeed rich in suggestiveness: the thoughtful reader will draw his own conclusions without resenting the writer's farewell remark. Whatever view we take of what is often, and somewhat vaguely, labelled the Jewish Question, however much we may dislike the religion or the irreligiousness of Jews, however divided we may be on the subject of Zionism, we may perhaps agree that this revival of the speech of the Prophets and Patriarchs, and this return to the tilling of the soil on which the Saviour trod, is calculated sooner or later to bring them nearer to the heart of truth, while our interest in their welfare and satisfaction in their linguistic triumph will, please God, for the general advantage draw both sides closer together.

A. F. DAY.

A MOTHER IN ISRAEL

THE LIFE OF M. MARY OF THE CROSS¹

SOME two years ago, Father G. O'Neill published the life of Julian Tenison Woods, to which THE MONTH devoted two articles entitled "The Astonishing Father Woods." He has now published the "Life of Mary McKillop, in religion Mother Mary of the Cross," with whom Father Woods was so intimately associated. This new book, dedicated to the Archbishop of Sydney, judge in the diocesan cause for the beatification of Mother Mary, has deservedly won very high praise, episcopal, clerical, and lay.

He has reserved the harder task, and possibly the better wine, till now. For when writing the "Life and Letters" of Father Woods, he was able to add the words: "and Adventures" to his title. That immediately suggests something exciting; and Father Woods certainly led an agitated life and was an agitating man. Plenty of people conspired to agitate the nun's existence; but it was not her fault if they were themselves, apparently, not a little agitated by her. Father Woods could rush about in all directions; scale active volcanoes; negotiate with British governors and Borneo potentates; meet Mountain Devils in Tasmania; have all sorts of visions and provoke them or anyway welcome them in others; reveal himself at once as man of eminent science, and as psycho-pathic (I cannot any more prevent myself from thinking him to have been so: but I am far from denying that hysteria might co-exist with holiness): but Mother Mary of the Cross could permit to herself none of these diversions, and she seems not to have been very interested in volcanoes even when she saw them (p. 386). She spent her time in managing the affairs of a teaching-order of nuns, and her adventures were entirely ascetical or ecclesiastical.

We have then to confess to a doubt, whether so long a book can maintain its interest. We think, that on the whole, it does, and hope to show that this is antecedently possible for three reasons. First, it is a necessary book because, without

¹ "Life of Mother Mary of the Cross" (McKillop). By Rev. G. O'Neill, S.J. Sydney: Pellegrini. Pp. xii. 411. Price, 22s. 6d.

its rich and sufficiently complete documentation, much in the Catholic history of Australia would have remained almost unintelligible. As it is, we do not think that the story of Mother Mary's trials will ever need to be written very fully again; a future "life" of her can omit much that seems to put the narrative's centre of gravity in her career rather than in her personality. But the second reason for finding the book interesting and not too long after all is that it does reveal her personality, and also, that of many eminent men with whom she came into contact, and almost, so to say, the personality of her period in Australia. Since a great many of the documents repeat themselves and merely hammer on a patch already sore, any future biography can omit them, and allow the mind more quietly to refresh itself with so exquisite a character as was Mary's, undistracted by new proofs of what already one believes. But a great artist will be needed for that Life! I do not think Father O'Neill would be incapable of being that artist, and skilfully abbreviating, and in a sense transfiguring, his volume. But the third reason why the book captures the attention is, because it describes the struggle between two high and (I daresay equally) noble ideals. In a sense, the book is a Greek tragedy, because everyone was nearly right, but not altogether. I confess that—speaking humanwise—Mary was the most consistently and beautifully right of anyone, far more so than Antigone! For the astounding instability of mood in many of those of whom the book tells us, their susceptibility and again their obstinacy, and finally their unkind way of doing what seemed to them the only correct thing to do, distress one, whereas Mary never distresses one. But, I repeat, principles were involved, and it is the clash of these that provides alike the tragedy and much of the fascination of the book. (An incidental pleasure may be found in Father O'Neill's chapter-headings. You never know whom he won't quote next—Keble, Boethius, Mme. Swetchine, B. Ramon Lull, Pius X., Dupanloup, the Scriptures, and many poets whose names are not too familiar to me.)

The McKillop family was modest but ancient and came from the Scottish Highlands. It had never lost the Faith. In 1835, it emigrated to Australia and about 1840 was followed by some cousins, the Macdonalds of Kilmolee. Soon, Alexander McKillop married Flora Macdonald in Melbourne

—that city having then not a single jeweller's shop, so that a gold coin had to be hammered into a ring! In 1842, their first child, Mary, was born. Her godmother was that Mrs. Caroline Chisholm whom Dickens wantonly caricatured as Mrs. Jellyaby. The child grew up sweet-tempered, amusing, and unselfish—once, when four years old, and climbing a hill with her mother, Mary begged her mother to "take my arm." And when she was eleven, *she* dismissed the hired nurse who was tending Mrs. McKillop (this nurse drank), and acted both as nurse and housekeeper, and managed well! But her father's temperament foredoomed him to increasing poverty. He left city for farm; and Mary became able to round up cattle and to break in horses. When she was only 16, she had already acted as governess, and had been made forewoman in a printing and stationery establishment, and, owing to her good understanding of the work, was selected to show a foreign consul over it. Hence, as basis for the future, you find a girl who was very high-spirited, with physical courage, a level head, of varied experience, of skill in management, and also, as other incidents show, of fearless faith.

Early in the '60's, Mary became a government school-teacher, and then opened a small school of her own, which sufficed to support her family. (It was during this time that an old Portuguese "doctor" said to her—and there seems to be sound evidence that he *did* say it, evidence all the better because people regarded him more as a queer old quack than as a mystic—"Miss Mary, I see you at the head of a long train of virgins in brown." And again: "You will be excommunicated; but do not be anxious: Rome and the Pope will set you all right again.") Meanwhile, at Penola, 90 miles distant from Portland where the McKillops were, Father Julian T. Woods had had a church built for him by Mary's uncle by marriage, and so, during a visit there, she met this priest. Father Woods, heartbroken at the sight of very poor children lost in the bush, going without Catholic education, and already dreaming of a teaching congregation like those he had seen ubiquitous in Europe, begged Mary to come and teach at Penola. The problem was, her family. Could it subsist without her? ¹ An arrangement was reached: Mary's sister

¹ On page 22 Father Woods is quoted: "Whatever be the results of your efforts on [your father's] behalf, I do really think he ought to be left to himself, even if the family be broken up. Can your mamma be trusted to keep things straight with your papa when you are away? I think not." Should this read: "ought *not* to be

Annie preceded her to Penola; Mary followed in 1866. On the feast of St. Joseph, Mary put on a quasi-religious dress: in January, 1867, the new bishop of Adelaide visited Penola, and called her "Sister." But Father Woods himself was transferred to Adelaide as episcopal secretary and director of Catholic education. Soon enough, then, Mary and her companions, already growing numerous, themselves opened a school there. By 1869, the Sisters numbered 60!

The flimsiness of the new organization became apparent. Father Woods received postulants much too fast. Despite Mary's entreaty that they might go to the Sisters of Charity for a proper novitiate, he refused. He would have liked their poverty to be more than Franciscan—no dowry should be accepted; certainly no State aid; they should own no property even as a community; education should be gratuitous so far as possible. He wrote an enormous diffuse "rule" in two days. Clouds, "no bigger than a man's hand," began to loom. Mary caught sight of the Director's visionary imprudences: she saw, too, that priests in Adelaide were at loggerheads. You could foresee, then, that whichever party approved of the nuns, the other party would disapprove *because it was* the other party.

Bishop Sheil in 1869 went to the Vatican Council. In his absence, opposition declared itself. The Sisters were untrained and could not teach (this was inaccurate: not all were untrained; and not all taught. Those unapt for teaching, nursed and so forth): Father Woods was hopeless at finance (this was true): the Sisters ought to accept State aid even though this submitted their schools to non-Catholic interference (this was arguable, especially as immense debts were foreseen and to some extent incurred): Father Woods encouraged "ecstasies" in the convent (and indeed, the two chief ones turned out to be fraudulent; they produced stigmata with jam!). Meanwhile, Dr. Sheil was encouraging Dr. James Quinn, first bishop of Brisbane and a most remarkable man (his brother Matthew was Bishop of Bathurst) to invite the Sisters to Queensland. He did so, and in 1869, having pronounced her final vows, Mary went to Brisbane with several companions. Almost at once, Dr. Matthew Quinn asked for, and received, Sisters for his own diocese.

left to himself"? Can even Father Woods have argued: "His children propose to leave him. His wife cannot look after him. Yet he ought to be left alone to fend for himself"? Possibly. Anyhow the family never did go under.

But the clouds now thickened, and the Sisters were to be driven on to three rocks destined, in a sense, to split their ship. First, the Administrator of Brisbane (the bishop was in Rome) demanded that they should accept State aid. Second, it was assumed that the government of the Sisters should be wholly diocesan, and not central. Were it the former, a central noviciate, it practically followed, would be impossible. With regard to the first point, compromises have nearly always to be reached—regrettably, in view of the ever-accentuated tendency of modern States to absorb the whole of education, even University education, and in reality to use schools as political weapons. Government inspection may, and usually does, keep schools up to the mark: Government appointment of all teachers, teachers moreover governmentally trained upon books and by professors so chosen by the State as to inoculate pupils with one governmental set of ideas only, is a detestable tyranny, towards which modern countries are fast gravitating. The other two problems lie in a different area altogether. At the root of them is this question—Are religious Congregations, forming self-contained units, yet operating in different dioceses and indeed countries, permissible and desirable? The Church has answered that they are: such are in fact all the great religious Orders. But it does not follow that their presence is always or equally desirable. For if they exist, central government and central training are certainly necessary. But a government, or even a bishop, in country X, or even diocese Y, might much dislike the presence of a group ruled from, and trained in, country Z. A thousand nationalistic or regional animosities could be aroused; and again, from the local point of view, there might be no stability in a group which a distant authority might alter or even remove, or in which it might establish customs that appeared suitable from afar, but not from near at hand. The question of central government is much too vast a topic to be fully discussed here: enough to say, that it is solved in the concrete by the hierarchic arrangement of the Church herself, who should, by all human laws, fly apart into fragments but does not do so. True, there have been many schisms: but modern history proves that schism is no more successful. The detached parts shrivel and die, or return to unity. Tension may often be great: unthinkable tact is required; but Rome supplies this. Also, she goes slowly: by a series of gentle touches she

was to corroborate the original idea of central government for Mother Mary's Josephites, despite the separation of one or two groups who yielded to episcopal pressure which presumably will be heaviest when a bishop tends personally to be a highly centralizing force within his own diocese. But the whole question of the relation of religious Orders to the hierarchy is one which is being quite gradually but definitely elucidated, and during that elucidation we have always to remember that such Orders are not of divine institution or structurally necessary in the Church, whereas bishops are. The antecedent probabilities, then, in the case of a new institution, lie on the side of episcopal control.

As to the central noviciate, however, which implies central government *somewhere*, the writer feels he must confess to a personal opinion of a very strong sort. If there are as many noviciates as there are dioceses, naturally they will be small. Now I think a noviciate seldom thrives unless it is large. Two or three girls will soon get on one another's nerves, and, be thrown back on to too much introspection. Moreover, good novice-mistresses (or masters) are few and far between. It is extremely improbable that every diocese could supply several—several, because we may hope there will be several religious congregations (each needing a noviciate) in a diocese. Such a system, to start with, runs the risk of having to use the best nun, or priest, locally available, who may not, however, be in the least suitable really: it immobilizes such a person, who may be much needed elsewhere: it is extremely expensive therefore in personnel, and also in room-space and cost. Moreover, the more localized is a noviciate or even a religious house, the more the local superior can introduce *customs*, which (as a matter of fact) are often far more coercive than rules, and much more liable to depend on private and often erratic tastes. Never once (speaking personally) have I failed to regret the multiplication of Congregations forced to recruit themselves from a narrow field (or to go forth on touting-expeditions for novices, running the risk of every possible delusion as to vocation), or again, the continual sub-division of that which started as a vital unit, or the reduplication of Mothers General (who, in some parts of the world positively make you giddy, so numerous are they, and all so exactly alike), or, in fine, the many manifest weakenings due to "in-breeding." Somewhat the same considerations apply to the further edu-

cation of teaching-nuns. Small units can with difficulty supply adequate education; still less, develop it.

On these three grounds, especially the second, were fought out the battles that despoiled Mother Mary's life of any sort of peace, save the most interior of all, which was possessed by Our Lord even on His cross. We feel, then, exempt from giving any details about this element in Mother Mary's career. The real issue was, Should the Josephite Sisters be one Congregation, or not? She felt that they should be.

"This soul," quotes one of Father O'Neill's chapter-headings, about a Breton poet, Brizeux, "is sweet and strong: it is a honey-comb, but a honey-comb hid in an oak." The quotation is happy. From beginning to end of the book, you find no trace of bitterness in Mary. And had her heart not been oaken, she would have been shredded to pieces long before the finish. Happily, through one part of her life, she had a really good counsellor in the person of Father Tappeiner, a cheerful, common-sense, intuitive, idealistic yet well-balanced Austrian Jesuit at Seven Hills. Her trials varied from what to us seem so trivial—the irritable pressure that her Sisters should teach the piano and singing and take part in general choirs,—to excommunication. With regard to the former, she did pray to St. John the Baptist to improve her voice: she was no songstress. The Saint, who presumably knows all about voices, answered by taking hers away altogether! (p. 20). Oddly enough, the one non-Catholic criticism I kept hearing about nuns in Australia and New Zealand was, that their education was purely ornamental—the only thing in which they excelled, was "frilly stuff" like music. It was untrue: but the Josephites were meant to be teachers of the *poor*.

When Bishop Sheil returned from Rome, he had to confront a very ill-advised cabal which made representations against Mother Mary. He began what some might call a persecution, anyhow a line of action which completely altered the structure as well as changed the ideal of the Institute. He dismissed various Sisters; and others declared they did not wish to remain in a body which was to be made into something so quite different from that to which they felt they had received their vocation. They had meant to serve the poorest of the poor, and they were now being removed altogether (they felt) from their life of poverty, were being separated into choir-Sisters and lay-Sisters, and being

divided up diocesan-wise till they would cease to be one Institute at all. Mary was suddenly told, last thing at night, that she must take the morning train for a bush-convent. She was ill; she had the bishop of Bathurst's invitation to place before Bishop Sheil; she positively had to see him about the changes in the rule that he supported and also enquire from the Sisters whether in such changed circumstances they wanted to remain in the Institute; and in fine said she could not go till she had spoken with His Lordship. Perhaps in this she was wrong. Who knows! Anyhow, he arrived next day, refused her his blessing, put her on her knees in the chapel, and, vested in pontificals, pronounced on her "the awful sentence of excommunication" for her "disobedience and rebellion," informed her that she was cut off from membership of the Church, from its sacraments while alive, from burial when dead, and was free to return to the world "a large portion of the wickedness of which, I fear, you have brought with you into this Institute." A new set of constitutions was read out: the Sisters rose and said that they did not wish to remain in a congregation entirely different from that which they had chosen to enter, and had been sanctioned by him in entering. The Blessed Sacrament was removed: Sister after Sister was dispensed from her vows and told to go home, and forthwith the bishop woke to find himself without anyone to teach, to look after orphans, or the Refuge, and much more of which the Sisters had had charge. Incidentally, he deprived them of the religious habit, but supplied nothing else for them to go home in. As a matter of fact, a Jew lent them a house; and almost at once the situation was seen to be farcical. It became recognized, not only that the sentence was invalid, but that the work of the diocese could not be carried on without the Sisters, and, despite the most disgraceful campaign in the press, the bishop removed his ban (to which, I must say, no one had attended much, though the personal anguish of the Sisters must have been indescribable, especially Mary's, who was told that it was a mortal sin for anyone to talk to her . . .), and died shortly afterwards (1872), leaving no one in doubt as to his essential goodness, nor that the illness he developed in Rome had affected his general balance and rendered him unable to master his moods.

Bishop Reynolds, his successor, till he too got ill, acted admirably in Adelaide where "discord invaded every func-

tion of Catholic life." Indeed, he, and the strong support of the two Bishops Quinn, put Mary back into a seemingly strong position, but, incidentally, removed Father Woods from any post of directorship of the Institute. The latter thought he accepted this decision, but never did, and thenceforward kept up a clandestine and most disruptive correspondence with various Sisters. Rather abruptly, in 1873, Mary was bidden, by Bishop Reynolds and Father Tappeiner to go to Rome and take with her the incriminated Rule.

In Rome, Mgr. Kirby, rector of the Irish college, took her to the Holy Father, to Cardinals Barnabò and Bilio, and to the General of the Jesuits. The Pope put his hand on her head, and, when he was told that she was "the excommunicated one," said "things too sacred to be spoken of." Mgr. Kirby judged that Father Woods's effusion was hopeless as a "rule," and the whole thing was re-drafted. He thought that the Holy See would not sanction the rigid ideal of poverty; but, that the central government should, if anything, be strengthened. Propaganda entrusted the examination to the Dominicans. Even they, in Rome, do not work at lightning speed. Mary travelled: Italy, Germany, England, Ireland, France. I like to recall the quite special, unforgettable kindness she received from the Convent of the Holy Child at Preston. She returned to Rome. Propaganda made over to her the "new rules" "to be adopted by your Institute." The "former Rules . . . could not have been approved by the Holy See." These were to be submitted to the bishop, together with a letter officially written to him, that "with his consent," they might be put into practice and, if they stood the test of one year, they must be returned to Rome, with suggested modifications, if any were felt desirable. Cardinal Franchi, Prefect of Propaganda, then praised the Sisters of St. Joseph for what they had done hitherto. The document seems to me guarded to the point of ambiguity; but Mary was overjoyed and was in Australia by Christmas, 1875.¹ The central government was "confirmed, strengthened, and clearly defined." There should be but one novitiate. Poverty alone was to be modified—partly for the rather startling reason that if they had no houses of their own, they would be "entirely dependent upon particular bishops," and might

¹ "She did not," says her biographer, "lose her heart to Ireland." No; but I think she gave it—though neither there nor elsewhere did she lose it or her head. Ireland still supplies her Institute with perhaps most of its novices.

be suddenly deprived of their convents, as at Adelaide, and that "a risk of such could never again be permitted." Yet as the sanction of the old rule was (so far as I can see) entirely that of Bishop Sheil, so this rule seemed to be not only *ad interim*, but to be practised exclusively in accord with the permission of the bishop. This might merely mean, that no house could be opened without episcopal permission, which of course it could not; or, that a bishop could refuse to have a house at all, but, that if he had one, it must for the present exist on the lines laid down in the Roman document.

As a matter of fact, the dispute continued. Some bishops consistently strove to get the decision reversed, at least when the year should be up. Indeed, in the long run, and not least owing to Father Woods, who fostered discontent in those Sisters to whom he got his letters through, a schism occurred, and has partially endured, though both *kinds* of "Josephite" communities have developed each on its own lines, live in amity, do fine work, and are beloved. And though the Sisters had to withdraw from Queensland and elsewhere, they have now been invited back again to Queensland, though not, I think, to Bathurst. Meanwhile, Rome was approving Mother Mary's line of action. To give further details here,—about the volte-face of Bishop Reynolds from friendship to violent hostility; about the strong support of the Bishop of Armidale, Archbishop Vaughan of Sydney (which became the centre of the Institute after it was evicted from Adelaide), Cardinal Moran, and the Archbishop of Wellington, would be very tedious and advance our understanding of Mary's history in no way.

What captivates me most in this book is, the temperamental history of nearly all these personages; and, what exhilarates me most, after reading it, is the thought of the Justice done by Time. Here is the Cause of Mary introduced—she who was once elaborately accused of habitual intoxication, while to lend colour to the suggestion someone upset some brandy over her head just as she was going in to be examined, so that the smell might seem convincing! It does not take long to learn that contradictories co-exist in people, even in very good people: but it is the *violence of the unexpected* that astonishes in this history. Really I am tempted to put part of it down to the Australian air, which people transported thither could not cope with. The South African air and altitudes are, without any doubt at all, responsible

for amazing aberrations and, I daresay, neuroses. The fierce animosities, personal attacks, public vituperations, abrupt oscillations of opinion due to evaporation or condensation of *moods* in men of high position and well-merited esteem—all this, I feel, cannot be fully explained by the chaotic times (Australia was very young; its inhabitants were very undisciplined; most diocesan finance was in inextricable confusion; the Irish nature reacting to the Australian one may have let loose, or provoked, the more explosive elements in each), nor yet, merely the clash of abstract principles of government alluded to above. If you are really puzzled, at times, to know whether falling in love at first sight is an affair of sheer electricity, or of the Holy Ghost, so here, you waver between the idea that the presence or lack of oxygen, or alternatively, the Devil, was at the back of these tumults. I honestly think, something of both. But there is plenty of material in this book for a student of suggestion, auto-suggestion, and psychasthenia (if the word means anything).

I hope then for a "life" that shall disentangle Mother Mary's enduring personality from so much that was ephemeral because sick, though of course her toughness—a most supernatural one!—cannot be realized save in terms of the strain inflicted on her: it was the worst strain, because it came from religious superiors who moreover were patently good men. When she says: "the good, kind bishop," "dear holy Father X," she means it, and constantly does say it! When she has to criticize, she protests loyalty and genuinely gives it; when she rebukes, she does so with transparent affection; she is so human that when a cheering letter comes, she reacts with "a good cry." The preternatural seemed to accompany her death; and Pius X. sent his sympathy, prayers and blessing to the Sisters. "Mary of the Cross" has begun to travel the path that leads, we hope, to our altars. And besides that, I want, please, a picture of those Sisters *at their work*, in tiny tin-roofed convents to which the children gallop up, three, four upon one pony, amid the vast shimmering distances of the bush, a few gaunt gum-trees putting their indigo shadowings upon the dust. I picture them there better than in the cities, and ask for some echoes of the holy gaiety I always found amongst them. Do they still say the Litanies for the horse, as St. Teresa did against—well—the "uncivil folk" that inhabited the horse-cloths?

C. C. MARTINDALE.

SPIRITUALISTS IN ADVERSITY¹

I

IF I use the term "Spiritualist" in the heading of this article, let me explain at the outset that I do so without prejudice, and that I am possibly applying it to a good many people who would themselves repudiate such a designation. Spiritualism is popularly employed in its larger sense to cover the tenets of all those who believe in the possibility of organized communication with the beings who belong to another world. These beings may be the souls of men who have once lived on earth or spirits of whose origin we have no knowledge, but so far as they are assumed to be discarnate intelligences existing outside this visible globe, the people who attempt to hold intercourse with them may fairly be called spiritualists. For this reason I do not feel that I am doing Mr. H. Dennis Bradley, to take a particular example, any injustice by grouping him under this class name, though one may note—gladly indeed, but with some wonder as to how the teaching of "Dr. Barnett" and "Johannes" can be reconciled with orthodox belief—that in his latest book he tells us quite positively "I was educated a Roman Catholic and I remain a Roman Catholic." He states, moreover, that he has resigned his membership of the various Research and Spiritualistic Societies to which he belonged, and that he regards the form of worship in the Spiritualist Churches as "deplorable and subversive." But it is not my object here to offer any criticism upon Mr. Bradley personally. We have too much reason to be grateful to him for his revelations, based upon an unusually wide first-hand experience, of the curious leaven of dishonesty and imposture which seems inseparable from physical mediumship. It is possible that Mr. Bradley may not be very willing to allow that the "living voice" phenomena in which he has particularly specialized, belong to that category; but with levitated trumpets flying hither and thither, and a recognizable voice which is held to proceed from a teleplasmic larynx and vocal cords, I do not see how the physical character of these manifestations can be disputed.

¹ "—And After." By H. Dennis Bradley. London: Werner Laurie. 1931. "Regurgitation and the Duncan Mediumship." By Harry Price. London: National Laboratory of Psychical Research. 1931. "Spiritism; its Failure." By P. Geuron, O.C.C. London: Burns and Oates. 1931.

The systematic trickery of mediums, which seems to be much more flagrant and organized in the United States than it is in this country, is probably largely responsible for the fact that so many American Catholic writers who deal with spiritualism adopt an attitude of almost complete scepticism in regard to mediumistic phenomena. Dr. Liljencrants in a substantial essay published in 1918 under the auspices of the Catholic University of Washington, set a fashion which was naturally taken to have the very highest ecclesiastical approval. It was introduced by a most laudatory foreword of the late Cardinal Gibbons, in which the Cardinal says: "The book is scholarly, it is scientific and it is sound in its thinking." The main contention of the learned author was that "while it is possible that spiritualistic phenomena may have been preternaturally caused, on the other hand over thirty years of careful investigation on two continents have failed to produce evidence for such contingency";¹ or, as he elsewhere puts the matter, "a study of the best authenticated phenomena on record has failed to show evidence for other than natural causes, and consequently we have arrived at the conclusion that spiritism cannot be shown to contain a preternatural element."² Close upon Dr. Liljencrants followed Father de Heredia, S.J., who was a skilful amateur conjurer, and who delivered lectures, afterwards published in book form,³ in which he demonstrated upon a stage, after the example of Mr. N. Maskelyne, that many of the alleged spiritualistic manifestations could be produced bylegerdemain and skilfully constructed apparatus. The same thesis was further emphasized by Dr. J. J. Walsh, and now quite recently a small book has been published here in England⁴ which examination shows to be little more than a summary of what had been previously written by the three authors named and one other. Now while I fully recognize the excellent intentions and the good faith of all these writers, a long continued study of the evidence and personal contact with those engaged for many years in psychic research has convinced me, despite what is, I think, a natural tendency to scepticism, that preternatural manifestation do take place at séances and that certain physical phenomena happening

¹ Liljencrants, "Spiritism and Religion," p. 273.

² *Ibid.* p. 268.

³ C. M. de Heredia, S.J., "Spiritism and Common Sense." 1922.

⁴ "Spiritism, its Failure." By P. J. Gearon, O.C.C. London: Burns and Oates. 1931.

with the best mediums cannot be explained away. There is an enormous amount of deliberate trickery, especially where poorly gifted mediums are making a living by what they do or pretend to do, and there is probably a good deal of fraud which may not be fully conscious. We must allow for the possibility that the agencies, whether diabolic or not are often mischievous, and that they find a malicious satisfaction in prompting the entranced medium to fake the levitations or the mysterious touches which are supposed to be produced by the spirits themselves. But in the case of D. D. Home, Eusapia Palladino and a considerable number of others, things happened sometimes in good light which it was physically impossible for the strongest man to have effected. Moreover, these occurrences are described by a multitude of witnesses on a variety of different occasions in such terms that it is impossible to reject their testimony without invalidating the evidence for any unusual event in history, whatever be its nature, and in particular without striking at the root of our whole belief in the Gospel record.

Among the physical phenomena of this kind which I should be tempted to regard as most conclusive are those described as occurring under the mediumship of George Valiantine. He is, according to the testimony of all who have had any relations with him, an uneducated man who knows no language but that which is common to all citizens of the United States and who in adult manhood was conducting a small business as a razor-hone manufacturer in an inconsiderable American town. He had no interest in literature and had never travelled until he came to England in 1924. He possessed, however, remarkable mediumistic gifts and in particular it was discovered that at his séances personalities, purporting to belong to the world beyond, spoke, either through trumpets or from space, in voices certainly very different from the medium's natural tones, and sometimes, it was maintained, recognizable as the voices of the deceased relatives of those who were present. Whether this was beyond the powers of a clever ventriloquist might be doubted except for two circumstances. It is alleged that more than one voice not infrequently spoke at the same time and also that the voices continued to be heard at the very moment that Valiantine himself was conversing audibly with his neighbours at the séance. This, I may readily admit,

would be difficult to establish quite satisfactorily by the evidence of members of the circle. People, even though we may assume them to be in perfect good faith, get worked up by anything which impresses them. They are excited by a certain confusion of sounds and their subsequent memory is far from exact. Still a considerable number of those who have assisted at Valiantine's best séances affirm most positively that the voices overlapped, and that this occurred under conditions in which it is impossible to suppose the intervention of any confederate. But what is much more satisfactory from an evidential point of view is the fact that these voices, not once, but many times, spoke in foreign languages, and indeed on certain occasions in fantastically strange languages. Professor Neville Whyment who is recognized as an expert in Chinese, having published a book on "Colloquial Chinese" (1922) and a "Mongolian Grammar" (1926), besides possessing a considerable acquaintance with many other out-of-the-way tongues, was invited in October 1926 to attend certain séances with Valiantine in New York, of which he has recently published an account.¹ He declares on the first page of this booklet:

I am not a spiritualist. I am not in any way connected with psychic research societies. . . My position is one of extreme simplicity, having no theory to expound, no scheme to foster, my memory is untrammelled in its backward groping, and my vision is unimpaired by any preconceived notions.

Dr. Whyment's impressions of the medium himself seem also to be worth quoting. He says:

Before the sitting began, I had a talk with Valiantine, who struck me as a typical example of the simpler kind of country American citizen. His speech was far from polished, he seemed to lack imagination, his interests were of a very commonplace order, and he seemed as much puzzled as proud of the queer happenings which appeared to have their centre in him. . . He was almost untravelled, and exhibited no desire to see or know anything of countries other than his own. Occasionally he made amusing (and obviously unrehearsed) blunders in speech and misconception, and above all he seemed to be always natural.²

¹ "Psychic Adventures in New York." London: Morley and Mitchell Kennerley. 1931. ² "Psychic Adventures," p. 18.

With regard to the séances Dr. Whyment's statement is quite positive. There was a voice speaking archaic Chinese with which he carried on a long conversation, and this not on one day only but on several days. Being a linguist with a wide range of knowledge of Eastern tongues he testifies to the fact that he heard also Persian, Sanskrit, Arabic, and Hindi, together with such comparatively familiar languages as Basque, Yiddish, German, Portuguese, and modern Greek. He had been invited to the sittings expressly that he might give some account of the strange sounds which none of those who formed the study circle could interpret. While declaring that he had no knowledge of the terminology of Spiritualism and that he was not interested in the discussions of the subject which took place among those present, he adds:

What did worry me was my inability to find any satisfactory *normal* explanation of the phenomena. Even if the medium had been a first-class linguist, it was manifestly impossible for him to be speaking in Chinese and American English at one and the same time, and yet all the sitters had heard Valiantine carrying on a conversation with his neighbour while other voices (two or three at one time) were speaking foreign languages fluently.¹

This is Dr. Whyment's straightforward statement, and it is to me the more convincing because it does not include any laboured protestations of the writer's good faith. The only explanation of the matter on normal lines would require us to believe either that Dr. Whyment was lying or that the hostess, Mrs. Cannon, a lady of assured standing in New York Society, was party to an elaborate series of mystifications which involved the admission into her drawing-room of two or more accomplished confederates. People who speak Basque and Sanskrit and Persian are not easily picked up in the streets even of New York. Moreover, Dr. Whyment introduces us to another voice from space which is of especial interest because his description exactly accords with the accounts given of the same personality who figures often in séances held in Italy 4,000 miles away. He says:

Presently there sounded a very strong voice like that of an Italian singer. "Cristo d'Angelo" was roared at full lung force! The voice in this instance seemed to soar

¹ *Ibid.* p. 47. This overlapping of the voices is attested not only by Dr. Whyment but by many other observers.

up to the ceiling and hover there. . . . Speaking at first in pure and clear Italian, the voice soon dropped into a Sicilian dialect of which I knew nothing. Before leaving the circle, however, Cristo d'Angelo was prevailed upon to sing a Sicilian ballad.¹

Now we have a detailed account of séances held at Venice in May, 1929, in the house of Dr. Piero Bon—he is referred to often also as Count Bon—with Valiantine for medium. Dr. Bon tells us that he was himself brought up in Sicily and and is thoroughly acquainted with the dialect. His description² tallies in every respect with that of Dr. Whymant. He describes how Cristo d'Angelo's exceptionally powerful voice seems to come from the ceiling, and how all the sitters instinctively threw their heads back and looked upwards while he was singing, whereas when another control, "Honey," sang a little English ditty in rather quavering tones, the voice was apparently at the level of their knees and they all bent downwards in their chairs in the effort to hear more distinctly. Here, also, d'Angelo sang both in Italian and in the Sicilian dialect. There were other singers as well at those Valiantine séances in Venice. "Pat O'Brien cantò in irlandese," which perhaps only means that he sang with a brogue, but a voice which purported to be that of Sebastian Cabot favoured them with a ballad in archaic Venetian.³ It is to me inconceivable that these details, attested by a number of people in good social position, can be purely fictitious, and it is not less incredible that a man of Valiantine's upbringing could have been able by any trick of ventriloquism to impose upon native Italians in their own country which he had never previously visited. That the voice which announced itself as that of Sebastian Cabot was really that of the illustrious explorer no one need be asked to believe. Nothing is more certain than that personation and deception, mingled with much that is veridical, prevails in all these communications. Personally I see no reason to think that adequate proof of identity ever has been given or ever can be given by the agency at the other end of the wire. But that is not for the moment the point. I am only contending here that certain of the phenomena which have taken place under Valiantine's mediumship

¹ *Ibid.* p. 21.

² Published in the Italian periodical *Luce e Ombra*, May 1930, pp. 216—218.

³ The fuller narrative may be found in *Luce e Ombra*, for 1929, October and November.

cannot be accounted for by any hypothesis of trickery, and that we are consequently forced to admit that there are intelligences outside this visible world which, occasionally at least, intervene in human affairs and try to place themselves in communication with the living.

But on top of this we are confronted with an enigma which for the last three quarters of a century, in fact ever since modern spiritualism began, has been as much responsible for the failure of these occult forces to win recognition, as the scepticism of the rationalist scientists who refuse to examine the evidence and will not allow the subject to be so much as mentioned. It is continually assumed that the phenomena of a medium who has once been detected in imposture must all be accounted fraudulent. Further, since the number of physical mediums who have not at one time or other been caught red-handed in trickery, is very small indeed in comparison with the multitude of those whose reputed marvels have made them for a time famous, it is argued that we are justified in condemning the whole fraternity *en bloc*. If some few have never been found out, that, we are told, is only because they have been exceptionally lucky or exceptionally cunning.

I do not wish to minimize the difficulty. It is unquestionably a serious one; and it is complicated by the fact that in very many cases it is the spiritualists themselves, be it said to their credit, who have detected and denounced the more flagrant impostures. A lengthy chronicle of exposures may be extracted from such a work as Podmore's "Modern Spiritualism." Perhaps one of the most remarkable cases was that of the denunciation of the medium William Eglinton by Archdeacon Colley. The name of the latter is held in much veneration by some of the most prominent advocates of the movement. It was he who took up Mr. J. Nevil Maskelyne's challenge to duplicate spiritual phenomena, a claim which was afterwards adjudicated upon in the law courts, and he is also remembered as the founder of the Crewe circle where remarkable spirit photographs are said to be taken in which facsimiles of the late Archdeacon's handwriting sometimes figure. On the other hand William Eglinton in his day was a very prominent medium. One of his slate-writing séances was attended by Mr. Gladstone, and he was constantly invited by minor royalties and people in high society to give them sittings, some of which it is

averred were very successful. Even during his life-time a big 4to volume, "Twixt Two Worlds," adorned with many illustrations, was published about him, and the imputations made against him in 1878 did not permanently destroy the confidence of his supporters. But it was no other than Archdeacon Colley who, in the year named, when some controversy had arisen over the exposure of another medium, Williams, wrote to a leading Spiritualist journal, *The Medium and Day-break* (November 15, 1878, p. 730) in the following terms:

It unfortunately fell to me to take muslin and false beard from Eglinton's portmanteau, and take him also straightway into kindly custody from a friend's house to my own, there keeping him a close prisoner from the police till night drew on and he could quickly get off by train,—some few days before this I had on two several occasions cut pieces from the drapery worn by, and clipped hair from the beard of, the other figure representing Abdullah. I have the pieces so cut off beard and muslin still. But note that when I took those things into my possession I and a medical gentleman (25 years a Spiritualist and well-known to the older members of the Movement) found the pieces of muslin cut fit exactly into certain corresponding portions of the drapery thus taken.

A medium, specializing in materializations, who was found carrying about muslin and a false beard in his portmanteau, would find it rather difficult, one would think, to persuade a British judge and jury that he was acting in good faith. This, at any rate, was what "Dr." Monck discovered when some of his fellow Spiritualists in 1876 searched his luggage and discovered it full of similar stage properties, as a result of which it came about that he was indicted under the Vagrant Act and was sentenced to a term of imprisonment. None the less, both Archdeacon Colley himself and Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, who shares with Darwin the honour of having given birth to our modern evolution theories, narrate the most astounding stories of materialization produced under Dr. Monck's mediumship. In Dr. Wallace's case that scientist averred that in full daylight a whitish cloud came out of Monck's side which gradually was built up into a draped female form standing clearly before his eyes, the two being five feet apart. Dr. Monck clapped his hands and the materialized figure also clapped hers, though more

faintly. Then the figure drew near him again and was slowly reabsorbed into his body, as it had come out. Archdeacon Colley narrates a similar experience with Monck, though in this case it happened by lamplight. The Archdeacon and a friend who was with him were permitted to touch the materialized female form, and he avers that he "felt the wrist, palm, fingers and finger-nails; yielding to pressure, having natural weight and substance, and all things pertaining to humanity, but it was damp and stone cold."

It is just conceivable that, as Mr. Podmore conjectures, Dr. Monck possessed some strange suggestive power which induced hallucinations in those over whom he exercised an influence, but there would have been no purpose in the trunk-full of paraphernalia—stuffed gloves, muslin, wires, etc.—if he had trusted to this alone. Such cases are puzzling, but it seems to me that the long conversations carried on with the living voice of Cristo d'Angelo, Bert Everett, etc. (steno-graphic notes in some cases being taken at the time, and veridical information imparted which was not always in the consciousness of anyone present) stand on a very different footing from the experiences just recounted. The hypothesis of hallucination may safely be dismissed, and I submit that there is no reasonable explanation of the recorded facts save a preternormal one. It is impossible in the short space at my disposal to indicate adequately the strength of the evidence, for the fact that precisely similar living voice phenomena have occurred without Valiantine's assistance in other circles, for example at the Castle Millesimo and at Genoa,¹ the same controls sometimes presenting themselves with the same recognizable voices and the same idiosyncrasies, must be accounted a striking confirmation of the manifestations previously observed.

Nevertheless, in spite of what seems to me the overwhelming evidence in favour of the genuineness of the most substantial part of Valiantine's phenomena, he has been detected in fraud and convicted by a form of test which leaves no possible loophole for escape, and but little for apology. Why under these circumstances Mr. Bradley should show himself so very resentful of the suspicion that has been cast upon the medium's behaviour at Berlin and at Genoa, is a little hard to under-

¹ Professor Bozzano (*Luce e Ombra*, 1931, p. 418), speaking of Cristo d'Angelo, very reasonably, as it seems to me, lays stress upon the power of this voice, upon its inimitable Sicilian accent, and upon the length of the *conversations* which it maintained.

stand. One may readily grant that in both cases the evidence was quite inadequate for conviction, but still the mere suspicions of honourable men who are not without a considerable experience of séance procedure, may claim some indulgence so long as they are temperately expressed. This, however, is a matter of very minor interest. The important fact is that Valiantine must for the future join the ranks of the untrustworthy and the discredited, and we may heartily congratulate Mr. Bradley upon the share he has had in bringing about such a result. The account of the detection presented to us in the book "*— And After*" is interesting reading, and the facsimiles are very helpful in making the evidence clear. What is not so clear is the motive which can have prompted the medium to run a risk of which, uneducated though he be, he can hardly have failed to realize the gravity. He had, no doubt, been highly successful in the imprint of the bird's feet and of the butterfly. Mr. Bradley had previously published an account of this incident, which occurred in 1925, in his earlier volume "*The Wisdom of the Gods*," and the prominence he had given it, endorsed by the technical experience of Mr. Noel Jaquin and Mr. Charles Sykes, may have stimulated Valiantine to attempt still bolder flights in the same direction. One cannot, however, but feel misgivings now as to the genuineness of that earlier effort. Anyway, the medium seems to have been encouraged to attempt some rivalry of the much advertised achievements of "*Margery*" (Mrs. Crandon) in her finger-print experiments, and accordingly preparations were made by providing smoked paper and modelling wax. The first trial took place at Mr. Bradley's house near London on February 20th of the present year, and the last a week later, two or three other sittings taking place in the interval.

On the first occasion a voice was heard somewhat resembling Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's, and another communicator announced that "Doyle has been trying to get his imprint through." One not very satisfactory impression was left on the paper, but although it was pronounced to resemble an authentic finger-print of A.C.D.'s, no positive conclusion was possible. Two days later an impression was obtained which purported to have been made by the spirit of the late Lord Dewar, and after some other inadequate markings had been attempted in behalf of Doyle, Sir Henry Segrave on the occasion of the last séance professed to communicate

and to leave his finger-print. There were also traces of marks on the modelling wax, which without Valiantine's knowledge had been impregnated with methylene green. Meanwhile an excuse had been made to obtain imprints of the toes of all who had been present at a particular séance, and from this it eventually resulted that what purported to be the impression made by Lord Dewar proved to be identical with that of Valiantine's left toe, while the Segrave imprint showed a remarkable similarity to the medium's right middle finger. Moreover, the fact of a fraudulent effort at deception was demonstrated when Valiantine was required to strip and a green mark was found upon his elbow. He averred that the ectoplasm re-entering his body at that point had caused the methylene stain, but it was pointed out to him that if his elbow had not been bared with some fraudulent purpose of impressing the wax, the re-entering ectoplasm would also have marked his coat which exhibited no stain. Finally, the finger-prints having been submitted to Ex-Chief Inspector Bell, formerly in charge of the Finger-Print Bureau of Scotland Yard, this expert's carefully reasoned report fully confirmed the conclusions just indicated. The identity of the alleged Dewar imprint with that of Valiantine's toe was so clearly established that if the charge had been one of murder the evidence would have sufficed to send the accused to the gallows.

Some further reflections on this and another even more remarkable exposure must be left for a future article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

RECONSTRUCTION

EVEN before the war was over, whilst still human skill and energy were busily employed in destroying life and treasure—ravaging fields, shelling towns, sinking ships—human foresight was diligently planning the remoulding of the shattered world “nearer to the heart’s desire.” It would seem that the spirit of man could not bear to contemplate that savage, prolonged, deliberate and wholesale destruction except as a preliminary to a process of equally-wide reconstruction, which should create a new and better world. All sorts of agencies arose, both Governmental and private, to devise schemes and programmes for repairing the damage due to war and for avoiding in the future the evils that had led to it. The Government created a Ministry of Reconstruction in 1917, books and pamphlets on social economy poured constantly from the press, religious societies were exceptionally busy in trying to direct zeal for reform into spiritual channels. The Established Church, which can set against the chaos of its religious teaching a sound instinct in social matters, pleaded earnestly for the Christianization of industry in a Lambeth Conference Report (1920). A prolonged effort to the same effect was made for some years previous to 1924 by a wider association of religious workers, the “Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship,” known as C.O.P.E.C., which published its Report in that year. The Catholic Social Guild devoted many of its publications—notably “A Christian Social Crusade” (1920),—and courses of study, to National Reconstruction. A stirring Pastoral by Cardinal Bourne in 1918, “The Nation’s Crisis,” summoned Catholics to the Social Apostolate, whilst the American Hierarchy in the following year condemned roundly the faults of the industrial system. And, of course, the economists, the financial experts, the captains of industry, all plied indefatigable pens in the endeavour, according to their lights, to lead the nation back into the ways of prosperity. In this multitude of counsellors, there may have been wisdom: there certainly was in the warning, stressed by all the Christian bodies, that the rebuilding of the city is primarily the Lord’s affair and that there is little use in seeking material welfare without keeping in view God’s justice.

But, just as some States immediately after the war joined the League of Nations against aggression and yet formed private alliances and built up armaments just as if no League existed, thus showing that politically they had learned nothing from that terrible experience, so here industry as a whole speedily slipped back again into the old ruts, and the class-war awoke with its old vigour and rancour. The coal strike of 1921, unprecedented both in extent and futility, and handled with almost equal ineptitude by all parties concerned, crippled the nation in the early stages of recovery, and yet produced no settlement. The history, indeed, of that particular industry since the war is a standing monument of human wrong-headedness. Its quarrels cost the nation far more than the Boer War did. Two costly Commissions—the Sankey and the Samuel—were set up to deal with them, and examined countless witnesses, discussed, debated, recommended,—and in the end saw their recommendations neglected! The whole evil of the Capitalist system came to the surface in this prolonged and unhappy dispute,—the deep-seated distrust and hostility between employer and employed, due to what Mill once remarked of the system generally—the fact that “the reward, instead of being proportioned to the labour and abstinence of the individual, is almost in an inverse ratio.” It so poisoned industrial relations as to cause that desperate attack on the general welfare in 1926, called the General Strike. Thus demonstrably the post-war efforts at Reconstruction were a complete and miserable failure. The coal-muddle was reflected in industry at large, until, under the strain of external circumstances, the machine in our own day has suddenly and dramatically broken down, causing this great and rich country, whose commercial integrity has long been proverbial, equivalently to default, and, by way of staving off bankruptcy, to allow its currency to depreciate.

If causes are to be judged by their effects, the system of Capitalism, as hitherto operated, has failed to justify itself. It has not developed any corrective to its self-destructive tendencies, any self-acting curb on that covetousness which is the mainspring of its energies; and since it has, almost ostentatiously, shaken off the control of ethics, it cannot of itself recover its health. Few of the professional economists—Beveridge, Hawtrey, Keynes, Pigou, Cannan, Withers, Clay, Stamp, Hobhouse, Paish, Cole, Tawney: their name is legion—

who prescribe for it, consider it as anything but a means for acquiring wealth and promoting material prosperity. In other words they do not seem to envisage, in diagnosing its maladies, the real end of human existence. For a helpful criticism of this product of the Industrial Revolution, which is thus of no long pedigree and is, in fact, evolving under our very eyes, we have to turn to Socialists who want to end it and to Catholics who think it can be mended. The Socialist ideal is that there should be no Capitalists, and it would abolish private property in the means of production, which makes them possible; whilst the Catholic holds that everyone should have property and be, therefore, a potential Capitalist. Both, however, agree that a system which, as worked, results almost necessarily in the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few, and condemns the many to wage-slavery, is not to be patiently endured.

The Capitalist himself—how far is he aware, not that the system is working badly, for that is patent to everybody, but that it must needs work badly until conducted on moral lines? No one now defends the Manchester School that looked on labour as a commodity and deprecated interference with the "iron laws" of economics, on the ground that entire selfishness in business was the best for the community in the long run. The brutal effects of that unChristian creed put into practice may be read—and should be read—with shame, in the Hammond books.¹ That theory is no longer professed and defended; but, alas! it is still vigorously practised. It engenders those anti-social trusts which cripple the operations of trade to the detriment of the consumer, it stimulates production whilst lessening the volume of consumption, it breeds the parasitic middleman, it inspires the sweating of the labourer, it provokes reprisals from Trade Unions, it discredits the whole of the system, because it is so essentially and manifestly unjust. The Capitalist of old fought the Trade Unions and every improvement in the lot of the worker, till humanity won the day against him, and now, in self-defence, he has formed unions of his own—the belligerent "Federation of British Industries," for instance, and the more conciliatory "National Confederation of Employers' Organizations." He has even, to the credit of his heart and head, responded to the labourers' overtures for peace. In September 1927, the Trades Union Congress formally disavowed

¹ "The Town Labourer," etc. (Longmans).

class-warfare and authorized its General Council to pursue "a policy of co-operation in an endeavour to work out a practical solution of industrial troubles by methods of conciliation." The late Lord Melchett, then Sir Alfred Mond, acknowledging on his side that "the real cure for unrest and depression is not lower wages and longer hours, but increased efficiency and output, lower costs, higher wages," induced many of his fellow Capitalists to recognize "that the common interests which bind us are more powerful than the apparently divergent interests which seem to separate." The result was that in January, 1930, the T.U.C., the N.C.E.O, and the F.B.I. formally ratified the action of their representatives who had framed the "Joint Conference on Industrial Reorganization and Industrial Relations"—a body which, so long as it exists, indicates at least the possibility of uniting Labour and Capital, but which, so far, has not succeeded in drawing the sting from Socialism. The question is—will this recognition of their common interests ever succeed in equating the status of employer and employed, and, by diffusing private property, abolish the proletariat? The tendency, no doubt, is there, although the very slow growth of profit-sharing and co-partnership indicates that it is not very strong. Ten years ago more than half the population of this country owned no property: three-quarters of the actual owners had less than £100 each: nine-tenths of the country's wealth was held by the remainder.¹ The proportion cannot have altered for the better since. Some more effective means must be found to amend Capitalism.

What is wanted is a new spirit in Industry. Towards the end of 1925 there was a prolonged *Times* correspondence with that title; but, although many admirable sentiments were expressed, the new spirit did not emerge from that correspondence. Such a change can result only from an altered view of life and the infusion into business dealings of moral and spiritual principles. Hence comes the importance of the utterances, growing ever more frequent and emphatic, of the Head of Christendom, on the ethical aspects of industrial relations: utterances which reach a wider public, are received with more reverence, carry greater weight, and remain longer in memory than those from any other source of guidance. The Encyclicals of the Popes furnish a standard of belief and conduct for the largest body of Christians, and

¹ Professor Clay quoted in "The Future of Capitalism," by L. Watt, S.J. (C.S.G.)

their influence persists in the Church's tradition long after their writers are dead. Accordingly, when in May of this year the present Holy Father, having contemplated the growing inefficacy of all attempts at social reform since the war, issued his Pastoral Letter—"On Reconstructing the Social Order and perfecting it conformably to the Precepts of the Gospel,"—it was to be expected that here at last there should be a sound prescription, based on a full and accurate diagnosis and wisely directed to the real cause of the malady. And all Christian thinkers will agree that that expectation has been fully realized. The Pope himself regards his Encyclical as a sort of commentary on the famous *Rerum Novarum*, wherein forty years ago, Leo XIII. reminded a world, given over to covetousness, of the rights of the working-classes and the duties that attach to wealth. "We deem it opportune," he writes,

first to recall the great benefits which this Encyclical has brought to the Catholic Church and to the world at large: secondly to vindicate the social and economic doctrine of so great a Master against certain doubts which have arisen, and to develop more fully some of its points: finally, after arraigning modern economics and examining the nature of Socialism, to expose the root of the present social disorder, and to point out the only salutary cure, a reform of Christian morals.

If it be urged in this after-Christian age, as many modernists actually do plead, that only believers in Christianity should be summoned to adhere to its moral teaching, the reply is simple. Our Lord came not to destroy but to fulfil. The Decalogue is pre-Christian, and it condemns and enjoins only what the sense of right, innate in the heart of man, condemns and enjoins. It is because Christianity clarifies, emphasizes, sanctions and upholds a code of conduct which is necessary for our proper development and which has been pragmatically justified, that the Pope can recall mankind, believers and unbelievers alike, to its observance. There is nothing arbitrary or "sectarian" about the moral law: to return to Christian ethics is to return to common sense.

— But while insisting on a change of mind and heart, without which external regulations are of little avail, the Pope exposes in detail the various economic flaws which have brought the industrial edifice almost to ruin,—flaws the essence of

which is a narrow and intense pursuit of material goods to the neglect of higher and better objects of desire. Like all the other instincts implanted in our nature, acquisitiveness—the desire of getting things—is good only up to a point, and needs to be checked and regulated by reason. Reason, especially when enlightened by faith, reveals many other more desirable things than mere wealth and what wealth brings—goods of the moral, intellectual, spiritual orders, goods that benefit and develop the soul rather than the body. It is those goods which are overlooked and even forfeited by the blind quest for riches. Men try to gain the world and only succeed in losing, in every sense, their souls. It is this misdirection and over-satisfaction of a healthy appetite which Catholic teaching, voiced by the Popes, arraigns, as the source of all industrial evils. It is essentially unjust and uncharitable, for it cannot be practised without a callous disregard of the primary rights both of individuals and of society. It is essentially and foolishly selfish, for it seeks personal welfare irrespective of the common good. Unless those rights are recognized and upheld, unless industrial systems and methods of production can be radically modified so as to uphold them, the reconstructive efforts of our economic experts will be in vain. Though the mistakes are in the economic sphere, being the mismanagement of material forces, their rectification must be approached from the moral side, if it is to succeed at all.

The crime of godless Capitalism has been, first, ignoring the natural claims of the human instrument which it employed and treating labour as a mere commodity; and, secondly, using the power that goes with wealth to acquire political influence for its own ends. Catholic observers like Mr. Belloc have long ago pointed out that, owing to this development, Capitalism and Socialism are seen to be akin. Socialism in practice would simply effect a change of masters, substituting for the rule of Big Business that of the bureaucratic State. We have lately seen in this country¹ a claim advanced by a millionaire Press-owner to have a voice in the selection of H.M. Ministers and to dictate their policy—such are the pretensions engendered by power without responsibility. The Pope shows how the excesses of modern Capitalism have sprung from unchecked “free competition” and the “survival of the fittest”—the “fittest” in this case

¹ See for further comments *THE MONTH*, April 1930, p. 359; August 1930, p. 165.

being "those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience." In words which suggest reasonable grounds for the late protests against "Bankers' dictation" he exposes the evil effects of secret financial power—

This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood to the entire economic body, and grasping, as it were, in their hands the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will.

This wealth, the result of a struggle for supremacy in the economic sphere itself, the Pope goes on, aims at "control of the State so that its resources and authority may be abused in the economic struggles," and this commercializing of Government frequently gives rise to international quarrels.

As unregulated self-seeking has issued in such disorder, the remedy lies in co-operation, both within the State and outside its borders. We have often recalled in these pages the days when ethics ruled economics in this country, when traders were punished for exceeding the Just Price, when usury was strictly forbidden. The devil called Mammon did a shrewd stroke of business when he persuaded post-Reformation England that wealth was a sign of God's pleasure, that the neighbour's need was one of the things that could be made to fetch a price. We are witnessing the result to-day, for we have lent our money—at high rates—abroad and cannot get it back, whilst the trade that it has financed enables our previous customers to do without our exports. The result is everywhere over-production, not in the sense that there are more goods than people can consume, for destitution is rife everywhere, but that there are more goods than people can pay for. Capitalism has over-reached itself. "In the early nineteenth century the economic problem seemed to be one of producing enough to satisfy the demands of a growing market: to-day the problem is one of finding a market for our industrial output."¹ Stimulated by a thousand labour-saving and labour-displacing devices, production has so far outstripped effective consumption that unemployment is universal in industrial countries and the markets are cluttered with unsaleable stocks of primary

¹ Father Lewis Watt: "The Future of Capitalism" (C.S.G. 1931), p. 9.

necessaries. If that is the inevitable result of the Capitalist system, then it must surely perish. "When private enterprise," said the late Archbishop Keating,¹ "fails in its primary social function [of providing a decent livelihood for the worker] it stands self-condemned, and no pleading on the score of economics can save it. The poor must live; and, if private enterprise cannot provide the workers with a living, it must clear out for another system that can." But, in itself and properly controlled, there is nothing wrong about Capitalism. "The investment of superfluous income," says the Pope, following St. Thomas, "in securing favourable opportunities for employment [and incidentally reasonable profit for its owner] provided the labour employed produces results which are really useful, is to be considered . . . an act of real liberality, particularly appropriate to the needs of our time." Thus, it is more meritorious, as well as more advantageous, to use superfluous money in useful trade enterprises, than to hoard it. The function of money is to facilitate production and exchange, and, when hoarded, it is not fulfilling its function. But the Capitalism which the Pope denounces, which has resulted in universal economic chaos, which is responsible for the world's twenty million propertyless unemployed, is not the beneficent system which helps the needy to earn their living by providing productive work, but a process designed to make money as quickly and plentifully as possible, and therefore needing cheap labour, and an oversupply of it that it may be cheap. According to the Pope, "it violates right order whenever it so employs the working or wage-earning classes as to divert business and economic activity entirely to its own arbitrary will and advantage without any regard to the human dignity of the workers, the social character of economic life, social justice and the common good." Moreover, by the formation of joint stock companies whereby capital is held in a multitude of hands unconnected with the business, responsibility for its use is also divided and the obligations of wealth ignored. "The worst injustices and frauds take place beneath the obscurity of the common name of a corporative firm." Immoderate desire for wealth, as the Pope points out, affects all classes: poverty itself causes a strong temptation to escape from its evils by fraudulent means. And the unending avarice of those who have already, and who want more, gives the very worst example

¹ *The Christian Democrat*, July 1926, p. 106.

to those who have not and want to have. And through their preoccupation with transitory goods, and through the evil material conditions in which the workers live, "vast multitudes of men can only with great difficulty pay attention to that one thing necessary, their eternal salvation." The Pope is full of compassion for the proletariat, exposed to moral dangers in factories and slum-quarters, and unable to develop its mental and spiritual faculties; full, moreover, of indignation at the industrial maladministration which diverts from those that need them most "those goods which the wealth and resources of nature, technical achievement and the social organization of economic affairs can give." "These goods," he adds, "should be sufficient to supply all needs and an honest livelihood, and to uplift men to that higher level of prosperity and culture which, provided it be used with prudence, is not only no hindrance but is of singular help to virtue."

The moral remedies for our troubles, the only sure means of reconstruction, lie in the practice of social justice and charity: the recognition of the Just Price and of the human dignity of the worker: the material remedies, not in Socialism or Communism, but in the widest possible diffusion of ownership, and the regulation, by industry itself, of trade-competition. The wage-contract, though not immoral in itself, has in innumerable cases worked badly in practice, bringing neither sufficiency nor security to the worker nor stability to the commonwealth, and laying upon "the teeming masses of the labouring poor"—(in the oft-quoted words of Leo XIII.)—"a yoke little better than that of slavery itself." Hence the Pope recommends that "the wage-contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership. . . . In this way wage-earners are made sharers in some sort in the ownership, or the management or the profits." This is a closer definition of Pope Leo's assertion that "the law should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many as possible of the humbler class to become owners." *Rerum Novarum* mentioned only landed property as a means of rescuing the proletariat from inhuman dependence and destitution, but obviously there are many other forms of possession which can produce the same result. It is an odd thing that the excessive individualism in commerce which the Pope deplores under the name of "Liberalism" or *laissez-faire*, has ended in the almost entire suppression of the indi-

vidual—a clear proof that the principle at work was evil. Through its operation, Capital is now concentrated in large pools controlled by a few to their own advantage, instead of flowing through the whole community to the advantage of all.

The difficulties of reconstruction which the Encyclical frankly recognizes, are more obvious in the constitution of this country than elsewhere. Our complicated Industrialism, although not yet two hundred years old, cannot easily be turned to a simpler order of existence. Yet the change need not be sudden nor violent. What the Pope suggests to replace uncontrolled competition and the undue sway of Capital is the re-establishment of something like the old Trade Guilds,—“vocational groups,” as he calls them, each composed of those, masters and men alike, who practise the same trade or profession. If we can imagine the F.B.I. or the N.C.E.O. amalgamating according to their several constituents with the corresponding units of the T.U.C., then clearly the class-war would be abolished, and each trade would be free to fulfil its own function in society. Social life must regain its organic form, and the State be relieved of burdens which do not properly belong to it but to its group members. This conception is not wholly new, as those know who have studied the literature of Syndicalism and Gild Socialism,¹ but as the only feasible substitute for the present anarchy, and the only real bulwark against the Servile State, it calls for close and immediate study. As an aid to bringing the Papal teaching clearly before the minds of all, we trust that Catholic sociologists will devote themselves to a detailed development of its applicability to modern conditions. We are so governed by custom that we find difficulty in imagining another economic order different from that in which we live.

Quadragesimo Anno stands on the shoulders of *Rerum Novarum*. It has a wider view of modern circumstances and clearly perceives that, since industrial relations are now so international, reconstruction must have a world-wide scope. “It would be well,” the Pope writes, “if the various nations, in common counsel and endeavour, strove to promote a healthy and economic co-operation by prudent pacts and institutions, since in economic matters they are so largely dependent one upon the other, and need each other’s help.” It

¹ A somewhat similar industrial scheme published by the *Week-End Review* (Feb. 1931) is discussed and appreciated as “precisely the ideal towards which Catholic thought is tending and has long tended,” by Father L. Watt in “The Future of Capitalism,” Chap. vi.

is to be hoped that the Government, lately entrusted with the task of restoring our industrial fortunes, will recognize this obvious truth, and, instead of declaring war on foreign commerce, will rather strive to combine with the foreigner to our mutual advantage. It will not be amiss to recall the famous "Financiers' Plea for the Removal of Restrictions on European Trade" issued in 1926 by nearly 200 of the world's leading Bankers and Manufacturers, the gist of which lay in the following statement—"There can be no recovery in Europe till politicians in all territories, old and new, realize that trade is not war but a process of exchange, that in time of peace our neighbours [*i.e.*, all foreign countries] are our customers, and that their prosperity is a condition of our own well-being." These good men desired a return to the industrial *status quo ante bellum*, but the truth of their words is independent of the commercial system in vogue at any particular time. The world is now an economic whole and must remain disturbed until its constituent parts manage to function in harmony. A chance was missed when the International Economic Conference was convened in 1927 and brought together 344 experts from 50 nations: political antipathies have nullified its excellent recommendations: the favourite "national" remedy for an international disease is "Boycott foreign goods!"

We live in momentous times. Many skilled and acute observers, notably the Distributists led by Mr. Chesterton, think that Capitalism is visibly disorganizing. The fact that it has created, and now cannot fully employ, the proletariat has sealed its doom. At any rate, all agree that it cannot properly function again without profound modifications. Whether these tend in the direction of State Socialism, the logical development of which we see in Russia, or in that diffusion of property, decentralization of power, maintenance of family integrity and individual freedom, which is the ideal of Catholicism, depends largely on whether the Papal teaching becomes widely known, *i.e.*, whether Catholics everywhere do their best to understand and spread it.

JOSEPH KEATING.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

PROTEST ADDRESSED TO THE SPANISH CORTES

By the five Jesuit Provincials of Spain against the Expulsion of the Society and Confiscation of its Goods.

[*Note.* This protest was evidently presented, or at least issued, previous to the passing of the draft Article of the New Spanish Constitution enacting the expulsion and confiscation.]

WE, the undersigned Provincials of the Society of Jesus in Spanish territory, have recourse to the Constituent Cortes with a demand, the justice and opportuneness of which will escape no one.

From the advent of the Republic the Society of Jesus, following the path traced by the Holy See and by the example of Spanish Prelates, has tendered its respect to the new regime, prepared to pursue the religious, cultural, and beneficent labours proper to its Institute, for the good, peace and prosperity of the Spanish nation. The Government has in its possession the proofs of this, and we, on our part, are conscious of having faithfully fulfilled our duty.

Similar, without doubt, has been the conduct of other Religious Orders; and yet, against them all, in large portions of the Press and at numerous political and social gatherings, a campaign has been waged, as though they constituted a danger to the Republic—a campaign now conducted in a more intense and aggravated form in Parliament.

It is true that, in many of these campaigns, the attack has been directed with special rancour against the Society of Jesus. But so long as the latter was included in the common cause and condemnation of the other Religious Orders, we preferred to keep silent. We considered it an honourable, and certainly an unmerited, distinction to head the list of the persecuted. So patent to the whole world was the sole reason of the persecution!

But now, when we hear that the very people who impugned the expulsion and dissolution of the Religious as inadvisable and opposed to International Right, are seeking to concentrate their assaults upon the Society of Jesus, when we see that they are asking for an odious law of exception, so odious and exceptional that the Society of Jesus would be the only one of existing Associations branded by the Constitution with the penalty of expulsion and confiscation, we should regard it as a grave dereliction of the duties attached to our office to maintain silence any longer. This might be ascribed by the Spanish people, and

even by foreign nations, to our fear lest the accusations levelled against us should be brought into the light, and to a studied policy of remaining in the dark, shielded rather by the tolerance or influence of others, than by our own innocence.

In compliance, therefore, with our duty, and in the defence of the sacred rights that the Society of Jesus has and represents, we venture, with the respect due to authority, but also with the calm and frankness springing from a consciousness of one's right, not only to manifest before the Cortes the profound sorrow caused us by a campaign purporting to excite against ourselves and our works the hatred of the noble Spanish nation and thus prepare the way for proscription, but besides to expose our reasons for asking from the Public Authority that which is conceded to the citizens of every civilized country, and to legitimately established Institutions—namely, that we be not condemned without being heard.

We are Spaniards, second to none in love for our country, and hence we possess all the rights recognized in the case of other Spanish citizens and which have lately been confirmed by the Constitution.

We belong to honourable families; and neither have they renounced the defence, that blood-relationship grants them, of the lives, honour, possessions, and persons of their sons and brothers; nor can we consent that a blot should disfigure their names, which are also our own. The depositions of parents of religious that have presented themselves during these last weeks to the government are proof positive that religious life has not slackened the ties that unite us to them.

We are Jesuits, and as such belong to a Corporation which, albeit spread throughout the world, is closely and peculiarly linked with Spain. Its founder was a Spaniard, who fell providentially wounded while fighting for Spain. Spaniards, too, were his most notable first companions; and its history is in great measure bound up with the peninsular and colonial history of Spain. Hence the Society of Jesus holds all the rights of a genuinely Spanish Association.

Let it be added that during the last fifty years our undertakings—religious, cultural and benevolent have multiplied, and along with them, our rights and duties within Spanish society. The houses we own and the works in which we labour are due in part to saving,—the fruit of thrift in regard to personal expenses; also to inheritance and gifts from relatives, and partly to the generosity of persons or societies that have devoted some of their possessions to the founding of cultural and beneficent institutions, and have confided the same to our direction. These founders have a right to expect that the Public Authority shall respect their will, and cause it to be respected; and that founda-

tional goods should be kept for their lawful object, without opening the way to breaches of justice, to pernicious precedents and juridical appeals, through violation of the right of property.

The Society's Activities. As to how the Society of Jesus has acquitted itself of its engagements; what advantage has accrued to society from its cultural and beneficent action; what appreciation our numerous undertakings have merited from Spanish society—it is not for us to appraise. What has been done is in the sight of everyone; we confidently submit it to the consideration of the Cortes. The deeds alleged against us in the so-called "anti-Jesuit" campaign—what are they? It is not with a frank indictment, in which concrete defects in our undertakings are put forward, that we have to deal. In this campaign, we do not meet with cases of any interest, and still less, with cases that show signs of a profound and objective analysis of our doings. Vague accusations are revived that have often been repeated, and as often disproved in past centuries. Ancient slanders are disinterred and reprinted, and new ones are invented after their model, devoid either of truth or novelty; falsehoods, calumnies, and even violent expressions abound. This is not an occasion for collecting and rebutting them. We confine ourselves to pointing out to the Government that it has an easy means for obtaining a true knowledge of the facts, and it can then proceed as justice may demand. Our activities are manifest. Ask the hundreds of thousands that have attended our classes, taken part in our Exercises, heard our sermons, have belonged, or still belong to our Sodalities, have read our writings, have visited our houses and conversed with us familiarly. And if these witnesses be rejected, as if they were all joined in a big conspiracy for falsifying the truth, so be it, let our adversaries only be heard. We only ask that definite facts should be specified and proved before the tribunals. Because, to refuse recognition of the Society's personality, to limit its right to possess and dispose, to restrict activity such as is allowed to other corporations or individuals, and even to dissolve it, seize its goods, and banish it—these are penalties that could only be justified by some concrete and grave offence, proved and judged.

We are speaking of the Society of Jesus as a body. For were it a question of individual members deserving such severe punishment (who, we have good grounds for believing, do not exist), chastisement should be inflicted on those culpable; it would be unjust, on their account, to penalize the whole body, whose laws they would have violated—a drastic penalty merited by anyone convicted of crimes punishable at law.

The Accusations. On our side, to the vague charges made against us by our opponents, we oppose the following affirmations. The first one concerns the nature and inmost constitution

of the Corporation to which we belong. All we members of the Society of Jesus have joined it, not merely with loyalty but with affection and enthusiasm, because we have judged it to be good and holy in itself and useful and beneficial to society and to our country. This intimate conviction—the testimony of our own conscience—stands confirmed by the witness of others. Not to mention the Roman Pontiffs who have over and over again proclaimed the holiness of our Institute, there are also rulers and men of science, and important centres of culture, courts of justice and entire peoples, who in different ways have given it their approval. Leaving past history aside, and only viewing the world as it is to-day, we find the Society of Jesus established and working peacefully and with general approval, in Germany, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Hungary, England, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Roumania, Yugoslavia, in all British dominions, in the Republics of both Americas, in Australia, in pagan Asiatic empires, in the Colonies of Africa, and in Oceania. And this diffusion under so many diverse forms of Government should be noticed. For it is impossible to dissemble the fact that a recrudescence of persecution against it has coincided with the advent of the Republic. One would suppose—in fact, some have said this—that the Institute of the Society is incompatible with a Republican form of Government, or that a monarchical form is connatural or consubstantial with the same. A mistaken and unintelligent appreciation! To the Society of Jesus—as to the Catholic Church of which it is a very small part—forms of Government are indifferent and accidental. With pliable activity it adapts itself to them all. It is as glad to labour in monarchical England, Holland, Belgium, as among the Republican peoples of America. And it is precisely under the most powerful and democratic Republic in the world—the United States of North America—that the life of the Society has developed with the most vigour and with greatest approval. There, in centres of Higher and Secondary Studies alone it counts 59 establishments and 60,000 alumni.

The second affirmation that we oppose to the accusations of our enemies is the public fact of the religious, cultural, and beneficent works which—side by side with the Secular Clergy and the other Religious Orders and Congregations—we, in our modest sphere, are carrying on for the good of Spanish society. It is impossible to set them out within the limits of this document. But in the pamphlet accompanying it, will be found a sketch of some aspects of our undertakings.

If it be contended that we are in error, or that we cunningly hide the offences which are imputed to us—which would suppose refined malice on the part of our thousands of members—and which are unperceived by those dealing with us most intimately,

then let this be established before competent authority. In the days of absolutist monarchy, Charles III. could promulgate that "incredible Pragmatic Sanction"—so styled by Menendez Pelayo—whereby, for "reasons locked up in his royal breast," he expelled without further enquiry from these realms four or five thousand Jesuits, and ordered their temporal possessions to be sequestered. In our own day, no democratic authority would wish to disgrace itself, by using power despotically for treading underfoot the most elementary human rights—the very basis of every Constitution in civilized countries.

We ask for no favour nor privileged treatment, but only that we be heard and have justice done to us, as is accorded to every corporation and individual. But if, out of animosity, we should be driven from our fatherland, or our life there should be made impossible, the sons of the Society of Jesus, after the example of their forebears at a memorable epoch when exiled to the shores of Italy, would pardon the injustice, and, praying to God for our persecutors, we would migrate in resignation to other lands, always bearing in our heart amidst unceasing activities, our love for Spain, our beloved country.

(Signed) ANTONIO REVUELTO—*Prov. of Andalusia.*

JOSÉ MARIA MURALL—*Prov. of Aragon.*

SEVERIANO AZCONA—*Prov. of Castille.*

ENRIQUE CARVAJAL—*Prov. of Léon.*

ANTONIO MEDINA—*Prov. of Toledo.*

(Translated from *El Debate*, for Oct. 14, 1931.)

F. M. DE Z., S.J.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Eve of a Great Decision.

Once again we have to write on the eve of a national decision, the character of which is still in the dark, whilst its effect for good or for evil must be momentous. Unhappily neither the revelation, in the Macmillan Report, of the extent to which the Budget was unbalanced, nor the growing signs of the world's loss of confidence in British solvency, which necessitated suspending the Gold Standard, could convince the great majority of the Labour Party that there was a veritable financial crisis, calling for national unity. They remained in strong opposition to the Government that balanced the Budget, and they are now appealing to the country, with a rival programme to that of a Ministry that is trying to be really National. The fact that the Government could not sign a united appeal to the electorate but went into the fight merely with the word "National" prefixed to the party-labels, has necessarily handicapped its chances of

a striking success. And of course the extremists on all sides have further confused the voter at home. The fact that the Conservatives are necessarily the strongest party in the new Government led many to advocate a full-blown Conservative policy. Thus, unless the majority on the side of Mr. R. MacDonald should be overwhelming, there will still lurk in the mind of the foreigner, whose confidence in the country's financial stability it is all important to recover and who will see in the Opposition a factor of much uncertainty, a doubt whether the necessary measures can really be carried; there will still be an impression of divided counsels and half-hearted efforts. It may need a further crisis, a greater depreciation of the currency, a more striking and constant rise in prices, and finally another appeal to the country, to produce a Government of sufficient strength to carry out the industrial reform necessary, and to effect those international agreements, both as regards trade and currency, which will be needed to prevent another collapse.

**Co-operation,
not Sectional but
World-wide.**

It is because it has become obvious that ill-regulated world-production and the lack of effective means of distribution and consumption will continue to create destitution and unemployment,

until there comes into being some sort of economic Locarno, that it seems questionable policy at this moment to advocate measures which will interfere with that world-wide adjustment. The idea of a self-contained Commonwealth has such a fascination for certain minds that they leave out of sight the wider interests which yet so closely affect the particular. "Cannot you visualize," said Lord Stanley, an election candidate, "a wall round the Empire, so that we could bring our foodstuffs from the Empire and sell back our manufactured goods? If this were done on an enormous scale, it would have nothing but good results." The speaker clearly does not grasp the needs of the crisis. His economic imperialism is neither desirable nor feasible. Apart even from Christian charity, the "lesser breeds without the law" which he would warn off the sacred soil of Empire, are necessary to our well-being. The United States have erected a magnificent wall, behind which stand her farmers and cotton growers facing ruin although surrounded by a glut of products, which, because of the short-sighted fiscal policy of the Government, foreign nations cannot buy.¹ The whole miserable industrial fiasco calls for world-wide co-operation, so that the battle for profits may no longer come between the starving multitudes and the bountiful earth. Any sectional arrangement, such as a Commonwealth *Zollverein*, is only tinkering with the problem,

¹ The evil of high Tariff-walls was denounced in America itself in a protest to the Senate in June, 1930, signed by a thousand U.S. economists, which ended—"A tariff-war does not furnish good soil for the growth of world peace."

unless it keeps the larger aim in view and avoids any steps in opposition to it. Protection may be necessary for the good of one trade or another; we can fairly ask other countries for a measure of reciprocity; we can set our faces sternly against the dumping of the products of sweated labour; but, since the causes of industrial depression and chaos are universal they must be dealt with by the nations as a whole. "Those causes will not be removed," says *The Times* (Oct. 22nd), "except as the result of international discussions and international agreements," and again, "the possibility of world-wide co-operation would be immensely strengthened if all the Governments of the British Empire were working together in unison, instead of separately as at present and too often at cross-purposes."

**The
Power of the
Banks.**

During the last few weeks the press-reading public has been attending an intensive course of economics, practical and theoretical, which would have resulted in a great advance in sound learning, if only the lecturers had professed the same doctrines and were not rather engaged in demolishing each other's theories. There are, no doubt, first principles in that science on which all experts agree; such as—"you cannot get more out of a bag than there is in it," or "you cannot both eat your cake and have it"—and it would be a great gain to clearness if some benevolent and intelligent person would tabulate separately all the points of agreement and of divergence, and thus furnish a firm basis for the discussion of the latter. However, even the most unmathematical can understand the meaning of a devalORIZED pound. Comparatively few people are embarrassed because the price of bar-gold, not in any case saleable in small quantities, has gone up, but we are all affected by the fact that in paying foreign debts our pound note is now equivalent to only 15s., and that soon, when present stocks are exhausted, we shall be paying more for our imports. The first thing that we hope for from the new Government is that the pound may somehow be made to retain its commodity-value in the home market, and that, as soon as possible, something may be done to set up an international monetary unit, of sufficient stability to support the credit necessary for the production of whatever goods the world needs and demands. Credit grows or shrinks with the growth or weakening of confidence; and thus confidence or credit, anticipating the results of future production, can actually add to the sum of effective wealth without any addition being made to the existing stock of gold. This precious metal, in fact, would not be needed at all in a world where confidence was unshakeable because never betrayed. But, because debtors sometimes default and banks fail, it has to be retained as a backing for the more convenient paper. The power

which the banks have of giving or withholding credit, and which they must wield in the interests of their depositors, introduces an anomalous feature into our social and industrial life, for, constituted as it is, the welfare, not to say the livelihood, of millions of workers depends absolutely on the way that power is used. And since the banks, which are the source of credit, are frequently foreign, it follows that the vicissitudes of international politics are added to the uncertainties of finance to make the workers' position more insecure. For this reason, it is of the utmost importance that the Government, in conjunction with other States, since all are literally at the mercy of financial interests beyond their control, should devise some means of regulating, in the national interest, this hidden and irresponsible influence. That it has been used for the most part beneficently is not here in question: it means power, without responsibility to those affected. We cannot blame the Labour Party, leaving out the matter of their views of the conduct of the banks in the present crisis, for looking upon the moneyed interests with much suspicion, because those interests do, in fact, hold in their hands the fate of the proletariat. The unchecked pursuit of money has resulted in making us its slaves. Accordingly, we think that the time has come for a serious reconsideration, especially by Catholic economists, of what is known as the Social Credit scheme, which aims at the radical reformation of our Capitalist system. The evils which it produces and the need of some such remedy have been lately expounded with admirable cogency by Dr. Coffey of Maynooth in our contemporary, *The Clergy Review*.¹ If Catholics are to help in the work of Reconstruction, they must become well acquainted with the flaws in the existing industrial edifice.

**The Pope's
"Crusade of
Charity."**

The growth of unemployment which is universal in all the industrial countries, so that in Europe alone it amounts to over eight million, according to figures supplied by the International Labour Office, and in America is not far short of that total, has moved the Pope to inaugurate what he calls a "Crusade of Charity," to deliver these workless multitudes from their misfortunes. Strangely enough, the President of the United States himself called attention to the need of Christian charity in an address spoken on October 19th. As an unwonted instance of a modern statesman going back to first principles, the fact, and the expressions used, are worth recording.

This civilization [the President said] and this great complex which we call American life, is builded and can alone

¹ "Capital Ownership and Credit Control." *The Clergy Review*, March, 1931. In December, 1925, half a dozen Catholic economists discussed a "Catholic Alternative to Capitalism" in *Studies*—a symposium which might be usefully repeated in the light of our fuller knowledge.

survive upon the translation into individual action of that fundamental philosophy announced by the Saviour nineteen centuries ago. Part of our national suffering to-day is from the failure to observe these primary yet inexorable laws of human relationship. Modern society cannot survive with the defence of Cain: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Thus, indirectly and mildly enough, the speaker arraigns the callous disregard of human personality with which Big Business in the States has long pursued its ends, and calls upon it, now, to divert some of its gains to its destitute victims. The Holy Father, whilst reminding the faithful of their being members of the same Divine family, naturally points their duty with greater explicitness and, without detailing any particular method, urges the well-off to succour their indigent brethren with self-sacrificing love. It is a timely reminder in these days of stress, for the first impulse of human nature compelled to economize, is to cut off expenses which are not obligatory in justice, forgetting that charity has its duties as well. And, whilst treating of brotherly love between all men of whatever nations, the Pope passes by an easy and natural transition to that modern phenomenon—the outcome of hate and fear—the vast wastage on competitive armaments, in denouncing which he echoes and emphasizes the pleadings of his predecessor, Benedict XV.:

Further, since the unbridled race of armaments, springing on the one hand from rivalry between peoples, and causing, on the other hand, enormous expenditure from public resources, is not the least factor in the present crisis, We cannot refrain from renewing and making Our own the grave warning of Our Predecessor, deploring that it has not hitherto been heeded.

It is to be hoped that these weighty words will convince those, if there still be any, who doubt of the wisdom or the practicability of a drastic and universal cut in armaments, and who fail to realize that to persevere in trying to secure peace by multiplying the means of war, is not only a sin against common sense but also in the circumstances against Christian charity. The little children of the destitute, deprived of their material and moral welfare through an unnecessary expenditure on arms, cry out against that fallacy.

**Common Sense
about
Armaments.**

France and Germany are discussing together their future economic relations,—a *démarche* which is the direct result of the late visit of the French Ministers to Berlin. To the official members of this "Franco-German Economic Committee" have been added a host of experts representing finance, trade, industry, agriculture, and labour. This is all to the good, for

the more the nations recognize their mutual and closely interwoven interests, the less likely they will be to pursue policies directly counter to them. Meanwhile, the French Prime Minister, who has declared his conviction that "isolation is not an adequate remedy" for the world-chaos of the day, is visiting President Hoover to talk over all the subjects that prevent world-harmony—reparations, war-debts, disarmament, the Kellogg Pact and its implications, the means of security, perhaps even the question of neutrality and the freedom of the seas. It is felt by many workers for peace that, short of formally joining the League, America could do nothing more likely to promote peace and to give life to the Pact renouncing war, than by declaring her intention to deny neutral rights to any violator of that agreement. The 58 nations which have ratified the Pact, including the States and Soviet Russia, have bound themselves never in future to seek the settlement of any quarrels, of whatever nature or origin, except by pacific means. Thus, the only further use for armaments that is logically left is to serve as domestic or international police-forces. Since the five great naval Powers have thus solemnly abandoned the right to use their fleets as instruments of national policy, either by attack or blockade, why do they not proceed to save their peoples millions of pounds by retaining only so many vessels as may be necessary to police the seven seas and enforce international law? Mr. Hoover is a sincere peace-lover, and keeps a tight rein on his own naval extremists: he has here an opportunity of initiating a disarmament movement of greater scope and more enduring effect than that due to start in February next. Meanwhile the large and very important International Peace Conference which is assembling in Paris towards the end of this month, being convened precisely to mobilize popular support for Disarmament, might well insist upon this aspect of the Kellogg Pact.

**The Real Arbiters
of
Peace or War.**

We are glad to see that Signor Mussolini who, on occasion, has "rattled the sabre" with more than Prussian vehemence, has come to realize that, in face of Bolshevik plans and activities, madness lies that way. He is reported to have said that he would reduce the Italian forces "to ten thousand rifles," if the other Powers would do likewise. He thinks that what the world needs is a prolonged truce to war-mongering, a decade of real peace, and considers that the Disarmament Conference is of the most pressing importance. "It is not only the existence of the League of Nations that is at stake, but the destinies of the human race." The year 1932 will decide our fate for good or ill. "We are before a terrible dilemma, the renovation or the destruction of our civilization." The words of powerful statesmen—these appear in *Les Annales* for August—are of use in giving guidance and in-

spiration to the multitudes, but it is the latter who decide the event. If the Conference fails to remove, or at least greatly to reduce, the menace of war, the blame will lie with the ignorant or apathetic public, and not least with the members of the Catholic Church. We rely greatly for the spread of true peace propaganda on the continued intercourse between Catholic citizens belonging to the Powers concerned. Our own Catholic Council for International Relations, which will be represented at a Disarmament Conference in Berlin in November, and doubtless at the larger Paris meeting during the same month, is doing much to co-ordinate Catholic public opinion, and could do more with better support.

**China
and
Japan.**

There can be little doubt that, were it not for the League of Nations, war would long ago have broken out between China and Japan. The trouble, which originated between irresponsible combatants acting without the sanction of their Governments, has been accentuated by the smouldering civil war which has disorganized the Chinese republic for many years, and doubtless by the machinations of Soviet emissaries who have long been aiming at injuring Japan through China. On those grounds, and not by denying Chinese provocation or Japanese grievances, should Japan be asked to act considerably. The matter is eminently one to be settled by the League and the World Court, and though neither Government is responding very readily to the mediation of the League Council, supplemented, be it noted, *ad hoc*, by a representative of the United States, there is little doubt that the quarrel will be settled peacefully. We know from the Corfu affair that a strong Government is always tempted to bully a weak one, but the League is more qualified to keep the peace than it was then. The usual phenomenon of nationalistic student-riots has unhappily appeared in China at least, which goes to support the view that the least wise of mankind are those who combine the vigour with the ignorance and impatience of youth.

**The
Spanish
Anti-Clericals.**

The moderate and dignified Protest of the Spanish Jesuits, printed elsewhere in this issue, against the project in the Cortes to outlaw them and confiscate their possessions, will be read with sympathy by all decent people,—with sympathy and also with wonder that such rank injustice as it reveals could even be projected, let alone passed as it since has been, by the representatives of a civilized people. But the narrow and bitter Freemason clique which has been allowed by an unorganized and apathetic electorate to usurp Parliamentary power, and is hastening, whilst its day lasts, to do as much harm as possible to the religion which it hates, does not truly represent Catholic Spain;

and its day may not be a long one. These men are acting according to their kind, for the lay State is necessarily anti-clerical. *Ecrasez l'infame* is their traditional motto. Their fellows in France, whose iniquities they are trying to surpass, succeeded in a similar policy,—up to a point; but are now held in check by a strong Catholic opposition growing in strength. If Catholic France had accepted and “worked” the Republic from the beginning, the Masons there might not have succeeded at all. We hope the Spanish Catholics will profit by that lesson. The Jesuits, who have been condemned untried and whose manifest good works have not won a particle of recognition from the Parliamentary tyrants, might have looked for some sympathy from this country whose boast is love of liberty and justice. Yet the secular press in general reacts as little as it did in the case of Mexico, and the following extract from a “Liberal” journal, *The New Statesman and Nation*, for October 17th, shows how your English anti-clerical interprets “liberty” and “justice” when his prejudices are awakened. Speaking of the disestablishment proposals, the Editorial Notes say (*italics ours*)—

This presumably means the expulsion of the Jesuits *whose allegiance is to Rome only*, and the confiscation of their property—the *vast amount* of which, by the way, is one of the main causes of their unpopularity. [An echo, here, of the visionary “milliards” of the French Congregations.] Feeling runs high in the country . . . and *there is even a rumour*, which we should be sorry to believe, [why add hypocrisy to slander?] that the Jesuits themselves [some 3,000 all told!] intend to take up arms *in defence of their money-bags*. . . The emancipation and progress of Spain are not possible under the domination of a reactionary and Mammon-loving Church.

Maledicimur et benedicimus. No doubt, this irresponsible scribe is not conscious of the indecency of his comments upon the misfortunes of these helpless victims of an infamous decree. To him, they are only “foreign monks,” whose notorious interference in politics and greed for gold are at last meeting their due reward. It does not occur to him to substantiate his charges: they are common form with his class: his final sentence betrays the true anti-clerical mentality. Yet, as a newspaper assailant of the late Father Bernard Vaughan found out to his cost, the British law would condemn him for criminal libel, if he dared to say of a Jesuit in this country that “his allegiance was to Rome only.” He is not alone, of course, in his ignorant bigotry. “Jesuits ready to resist expulsion” is a recent poster-caption of the *Daily Telegraph*, whilst the *Daily Mail* goes one better with “Machine-Guns in Convent Armed against Spain’s Rulers.” The catch-penny papers *must* have “sensation” at any cost.

**In Defence
of the
Spanish Religious.**

For the credit of the English press,—and, apart from the professionally anti-Catholic ones, there are other papers, notably the *Observer*, equally bigoted and unfair—we are glad to testify to the general intelligence and impartiality of *The Times* Madrid correspondent, and to record that the *Church Times*, in its issue of October 16th, published a full and reasoned defence of the Religious Orders in Spain, from the pen of Professor Allison Peers, an expert of international reputation in the history and literature of Spain, and one qualified by long residence in the Peninsula to understand the mentality and the achievements of the Spaniard. The Professor shows the baselessness of the anti-clerical charges, and their baseness as well: for the Religious Orders have done and are doing in Spain work of the highest value for education and social welfare. He testifies to the high level of scholarship maintained by the Religious through their great libraries and institutes for teaching, and laments that he has room only for the merest sketch of their beneficent functions. Catholics and others, with access to the numerous high-class reviews and other publications issued in Spain by the Religious, know that they are in the forefront of all cultural activities, not only theological but also scientific (the Jesuit Observatory at Tortosa, for instance, is famous), historical and social. But,—they uphold religion, and that is enough to secure their condemnation at the hands of men who take their policy from the Lodges and their inspiration from Russia.

**Silence of the
International Institute
of Intellectual
Co-operation.**

Professor Peers's generous *apologia* for the victims, as he styles them, of "base ingratitude and rank injustice" has set a suggestive example to the hosts of other scholars who have benefited in their time by the religious culture of Spain. We recollect during the war that learned and eminent men, belonging to the countries in conflict, combined occasionally to protest against acts and policies which tended permanently to injure the brotherhood of arts and literature. In order to consolidate that brotherhood there was inaugurated, as one of the Permanent Committees of the League of Nations, the "International Institute of Intellectual Co-operation," which has been housed in France and is supported by French funds. It has the worthy object of pooling the results of scientific research and organizing the various departments of mental activity on an international basis. But it would surely be a very apposite act, and one thoroughly in keeping with the character of the League, if these international intellectuals would co-operate in remonstrating against the proposed wholesale expulsion from Spain of savants and scholars, and the high-handed confiscation of their pro-

perty. Such an expostulation would be, we repeat, only natural and seemly on the part of the International Institute; nay, we shall go so far as to say that, if no protest is issued from that source, the omission will indicate that the Institute is wanting in true zeal for scholarship or, alternatively,—for this too has been said of it—that it is somewhat under the influence of Freemasonry.

**More Fruits
of
Anti-Clericalism.**

After vainly opposing Article XXIV. of the Constitution,—that which expels the Jesuits from Spain and forbids other Orders to teach—the majority of the Catholic deputies withdrew from the Cortes in order to organize, late though it be, extra-Parliamentary opposition, and the Assembly then passed “by acclamation” Article XLI., which establishes divorce by consent and gives illicit unions the same status as real marriage; thus introducing, as *The Times* (October 19th) mildly says, “sweeping changes into Spanish life.” We hope there is sufficient Christianity left in this country to stigmatize these measures as they deserve, but remembering how loth Protestantism is to condemn the persecutors of the Church, our hope is weak. At any rate there should be enough Christians amongst the five million new women voters in Spain to bring about the defeat of this Satanic attack on the family. The Holy Father has sent a message of sympathy to the persecuted Catholics, at the same time emphatically denouncing the multiplied offences against religious and civil liberty contained in the new Constitution, and summoning all the forces of good to prayer and active co-operation in order to repair the damage. Even non-Catholic deputies are alarmed at the indecent haste with which these anti-clerical doctrinaires are endeavouring to achieve State absolutism, a regime which, by ignoring God, effects the enslavement of man. If the results were not likely to be so tragic, the spectacle of these atheists, in their brief moment of power, trying once again to resuscitate the dead and demonstrably damned ideals of the French Revolution, would be supremely ridiculous. The judgment of the right-minded upon these projects was adequately expressed by *The Times* correspondent, writing on October 9th before Señor Zamora, the Catholic President, resigned, and the anti-clericals got their way:

There will be reforms, and divorce will certainly be provided for, but it would be madness for the Cortes to decide the expulsion of the religious orders and confiscation of their properties. This was tried once before in the days of Mendizabel, nearly a century ago, when the Church was richer than to-day. It was calculated then that by this means the National debt would be wiped out. The utter failure of the

reform is well known, and it would be unworthy of the Republic to repeat an experiment, the dire and pitiable results of which are still being felt.

And the correspondent goes on to enumerate, although not in such detail as Professor Peers has done, the vast benefits, social, educational and charitable, conferred on Spain by the Orders, whose work their enemies are preparing to destroy, with utter disregard for the country's welfare.

The Delusions of General Ludendorf. General Ludendorf, author of a mischievous book called "The Coming War," should be glad that his enemies, in Spain at least, are at variance amongst themselves. He is well known to have "Jesuits on the brain" and to see their machinations in many places where less-gifted detectives are at fault. But Jews and Freemasons and Fascists also haunt his mind, and he finds in the plots and counter-plots of all these fiendish agencies an explanation of European unrest. The Masons and the Jews stir up France against Italy: the Jesuits and Fascists arouse Italy against France, and so forth. We are not saying that secret societies are not often responsible for political upheavals. Portugal in 1910 and Spain to-day illustrate their power. So far there is substance in Ludendorf's puerilities, but he should not rank Fascists or Jesuits with secret societies like the Freemasons. These latter abroad are essentially anti-civic and anti-religious. The British press has become wiser since 1910, when the Portuguese rebels were hailed as enlightened democrats. Signor Mussolini's action in suppressing Masonry in Italy has not been condemned. And lately when the latest Portuguese revolt was quenched—there have been about twenty in as many years—*The Times* spoke plainly about the subversive influence of Masonry. "It is common knowledge that this agitation has been fomented by exiled Portuguese politicians in Paris, and particularly by some former chiefs of the Grand Orient of Portugal, a Masonic body which has become an association of anti-clerical log-rollers." These are strong words from a paper with *The Times'* antecedents. It may come to pass that British journalists will finally realize that to be anti-clerical is not necessarily to possess every imaginable virtue. In that case, some of the anti-clerical projects of the present Spanish Government may be appraised on their intrinsic merits and not considered statesmanlike merely because directed against the Church.

Catholic Action needed in Ireland. Not before action was needed have Church and State combined in Ireland to put down the forces of disorder which, alleging political or economic pretexts, have long been trying to subvert, not only the Constitution which the majority adhere to,

but also the traditional Catholic Faith of the country. The Government passed a drastic public-defence Bill on October 16th, directed against the secret societies, republican and communistic, which are trying, by illegal and criminal means, to overthrow it. The measure is called a "Constitutional Amendment Act," for *de facto* it suspends many of the provisions of the Constitution in protection of personal liberty, freedom of speech, and trial by ordinary process of law. We gave some instances last September of the character of the subversive agitation, but only those on the spot can well judge of the political necessity of the measures taken against it. However, all doubt concerning the moral harm done to the national character by the unlawful pursuit of impracticable and, in some cases, definitely immoral ideals, is removed from the minds of Catholics by the exceedingly outspoken Pastoral of the Irish Hierarchy read in all churches on October 18th. This solemn joint declaration, signed by the four Archbishops and twenty-four Bishops, specifically condemns the attempts of the secret Republican army to destroy the Constitution by force, and the endeavour, under Bolshevik influences, "to impose upon the Catholic soil of Ireland the same materialistic regime, with its fanatical hatred of God, as now dominates Russia and threatens to dominate Spain." The Government has proclaimed no less than a dozen of these revolutionary associations—a sad token of the extent of the evil to be met. There are some who have held that there is no room for Catholic Action in Ireland, that the laity should confine themselves to saving their souls by means of sodalities and pious associations, and not band together to Christianize public life, now largely influenced by un-Christian ideals. We hope the Bishops' Pastoral will open the eyes of these ill-advised folk to the imperative need of restoring to Ireland the character, which her history and traditions say she ought to have, of a thoroughly Catholic nation. They have the recent history of Mexico, they have the present spectacle of Spain, to indicate what may follow the lack of a wide-awake Catholic spirit. We doubt whether this apathy is widespread in Ireland. A decree of the last Maynooth Synod calls upon all Catholics "united in societies, to form an organized army which shall put forth all its powers to mould the public conscience in accordance with Catholic principles" (No. 233). There are many such societies,—the League of the Kingdom of Christ, the C.T.S., the S.V.P., and a host of others—but they do not yet form an army. Otherwise, we should have expected Catholic Ireland to have hailed at least once, with public demonstrations of gratitude and acceptance, as the scattered Catholics of this island have done at some thirty meetings, such a momentous declaration on the Restoration of the Social Order as the Pope's "Quadragesimo Anno."

**Catholic
Higher Studies.**

An enterprise which contains within it the germs of great things was inaugurated on Monday, October 19th, at the Offices of the C.T.S., Westminster. It is called the Catholic Institute of Higher Studies, and has been set on foot by the Cardinal, under the Presidency of Archbishop Goodier, in order to furnish educated Catholics with the opportunity of studying theology, philosophy, scripture, and Church history—subjects which Newman, in his famous University lectures, claimed to be an integral part of liberal education. A corps of Professors has been selected and lectures will be delivered in the three hours from 6 to 9 p.m. on three days every week during each of the three terms. The fees are very moderate, and diplomas will be awarded at the end of the course (normally, of three years) to successful students. A similar, but less elaborate, scheme has also been started in East London by the Franciscan Fathers, to provide advanced religious instruction to University students, whilst the Dominicans continue their lectures on St. Thomas at London University. Such activities cannot but bear fruit in spreading the Faith, that treasury of all-important knowledge, out of which so many Catholics have not the opportunity, or alas! the will, to enrich themselves.

**Straws in the
Wind.**

On the singular grounds that "we are now living in the twentieth not the nineteenth century," and that public opinion has changed in the matters of summer time, cremation and birth-control, the President of the Society of Medical Officers of Health stated on October 16th that he had drafted a Bill to make voluntary euthanasia, under certain restrictions, legal. It is all, of course, in the interests of "true morality," which the M.O. seems to consider, not without warrant from modernist moralists, a matter of fashion. Again, *The Times*, on October 22, 1927, reported a High Court Judge as lamenting that whereas the law punished a man for allowing a hopelessly injured animal to live, a father (in this case) had to be sentenced for drowning his incurable child. And on October 24th last year a Surrey doctor, at a meeting of a Society for Aiding Mental Deficients said openly—"As regards idiots, I cannot see any alternative but the lethal chamber. Such people should not be a drag on the community." Of God and His commandments, no thought or word. Russia shows a greater advance towards ethical emancipation, but these after-Christian gentlemen are well on the way. No doubt, our Catholic Medical Guild will have something to say about the M.O.'s proposed betrayal of the physician's first duty. But he won the prompt approval of a prominent Anglican!

**In Aid of
the State.**

As soon as the financial crisis came upon us, we looked for a repetition of the spirit which moved certain rich men, shortly after the War, voluntarily to transfer a portion of their fortune to the State which had exerted itself so strenuously to preserve it all. It is now well-known that the man who then started the ball in this fashion was Mr. Stanley Baldwin, who presented £120,000, one-fifth of his estate, to the nation, in June, 1919, hoping that others—and they were many—who had profited financially by the War would similarly contribute to the reduction of the National Debt. The ball, alas, did not roll very far: there was another like gift in January, 1920, and a comparatively poor man, who, by a life-time of saving, had gathered £10,000, nobly sacrificed one-fifth of that amount, but the response, as far as it became public, ended there. On the present occasion, apart from the generous contributions of the King and the Royal Family, which showed their sense of the gravity of the situation and their public spirit, there have been very few “benevolences” of the sort, and those few not large. Some attempts have been made through the Press to stimulate a national concerted effort, but without avail. The fact is the rich may well consider that the State now takes so much of their income that, in their case, “richesse oblige” may be interpreted merely as a determination to submit with as good grace as possible to the demands of the Exchequer. When we learn (as was stated in the Commons on September 23rd) that, what with income tax, supertax and capitalized value of death-duties, a man with £25,000 a year must forfeit £21,000, and that an income of £50,000, at present rates, is wholly absorbed by the State, we can realize why, on occasion of this, let us hope, passing emergency, there are no “benevolences.”

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Education, Catholic Obligations under Canon Law [P. L. Blakeley in *America*, Sept. 12, 1931, p. 544].

Suarez on International Law [J. Catry in *Revue Apologetique*, Oct. 1931, p. 296].

Suffering, The Mystery of [Rev. C. Lucey in *Studies*, Sept. 1931, p. 394].

Temporal Power: political philosophy of [F. R. Hoare in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Oct. 1931, p. 364].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anti-Christianity as taught in American Universities [W. J. Lonergan, S.J., in *America*, Sept. 26, 1931, p. 587].

Anti-Clericalism in Spain [T. J. O'Donnell in *Studies*, Sept. 1931, p. 481].

Blavatsky, Mme, Foundress of Theosophy, True Character of [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Studies*, Sept. 1931, p. 421].

Evolutionary Theories, Chaos of [G. McC. Price in *Catholic World*, Oct. 1931, p. 21].

Fascism and the Church: Resumé of conflict about Catholic Action [*Documentation Catholique*, Oct. 3—10, 1931].

Morality, Need of a fixed [J. Gillis, C.S.P., in *Catholic World*, Oct. 1931, p. 98].

Spanish Anti-Clericalism, Significance of [H. Belloc in *Universe*, Oct. 16, 1931, p. 10: Protests against: Rev. M. Grana in *Catholic Times*, Oct. 16, 1931, p. 12].

Spanish Jesuits: Their vindication against false charges, by the Five Provincials of Spain [*Month*, Nov. 1931, p. 449].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Catholic and Other Missions in South Africa [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *America*, Sept. 19, 1931, p. 563].

Catholics and the Colour Bar in U.S.A. [John LaFarge, S.J., in *America*, Sept. 26, 1931, p. 585].

Catholic Social Order, Postulates of [S. D. Fox in *Catholic World*, Oct. 1931, p. 1].

Ecclesiastical Studies: New Decree concerning [C. Boyer in *Etudes*, Oct. 5, 1931, p. 5].

Paul St., The true character of [C. Lattey, S.J., in *Clergy Review*, Oct. 1931, p. 290].

Psychology, "Scientific" [Dom H. R. Williams in *The Sower*, Oct.—Dec. 1931, p. 12].

Slavery, The Church and [M. E. Edwards in *Christian Democrat*, Oct. 1931, p. 147].

Socialism, The New [H. Somerville in *Studies*, Sept. 1931, p. 438].

Spain, Causes of the Debâcle in [B. Grimley in *Catholic Gazette*, July 1931, p. 193: Pierre Lhande in *Etudes*, May 5, 1931, p. 285: Sane Views on, A. Parker in *Blackfriars*, June 1931, p. 331].

Teresa Neumann, Account of [Dr. K. Schjelderup in *Catholic World*, Oct. 1931, p. 63].

Wells's, H. G., "Outline of Science" exposed [H. Belloc in *Universe*, July 10, 1931, p. 7].

Westminster Catholic Federation; Silver Jubilee [*Tablet*, June 27, 1931, p. 854].

Wolsey's Services to Education [T. Corcoran, S.J., in *Studies*, March 1931, p. 24].

REVIEWS

I—THE MIND AND THE MEMBERS¹

THERE is much to praise in this book; some statements are of doubtful validity; and there are a few blemishes that can easily be corrected in a second edition—which it certainly deserves. The author does not claim to have exhausted his subject, even in dealing with it merely as a natural science, as he makes clear in his "Conclusion." "We are of course aware," he says, "that we have only touched upon some fragments of the great theme of which we purposed to treat." But what he has to say is, for the most part, well said. His study is chiefly concerned with the character-formation of children, and should therefore appeal to parents, school-teachers and instructors generally.

As the basis of character he places "the primitive urge to self-assertion," the "will to power," and the "will to community." The way in which these personal forces react upon the human being's environment and adjust themselves to it determines his character. He is, like Adler, and indeed like many others, suspicious of an appeal to hereditary factors to explain character. Not that he denies their existence; in fact, as he himself says towards the close of his book, he presupposes them. For, taking for granted the psycho-physical unity of man, he assumes as a necessary corollary that his physical make-up forms part of his experience. But we think his view on this point is (for it is difficult sometimes to grasp his real meaning) substantially the same as that of Professor A. E. Taylor, who says on this point: "Whether a native sensibility to the attractions of sex or of alcohol will be the foundation of a moral virtue or of a vice, depends on the attitude of a man through life to these tendencies. If a man, knowing that he has these proclivities, resolutely sets himself to master them, instead of allowing them to master him, their very presence may be the secret explanation of a command over elementary appetites which is exceptionally complete." A person may have congenital tendencies, but may resolutely set himself to combat them, and so evolve a fine character.

Of more doubtful value are the examples Allers gives to show in the concrete his theory of "Compensation." "Quite a number of small men," he says on p. 95, "can show remarkable muscular accomplishments—for example, distinguished mountaineers. Amongst famous generals we find unusually small men,

¹ *The Psychology of Character.* By Rudolf Allers, M.D. Translated by E. B. Strauss, M.A. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. xv. 383. Price, 16s. 1931.

like Eugene of Savoy, or Napoleon, or men otherwise physically defective, like Narses."

Of these examples, it may be said that there is nothing in the nature of things why small men should not be endowed with fine physique and muscle, and there is no reason to look on their mountaineering feats as a compensation for their small size. Moreover, men of average, or of more than average height and size may show the same qualities. The same may be said of his examples taken from great generals. In fact, by choosing favourable examples, it might be possible to prove the opposite thesis. Not that this theory of "Compensation" has not its legitimate sphere, and we think the author is on surer ground when, on pp. 129 ff, he treats of Fantasy and the necessity for compensation. We heartily recommend the reader to study this section carefully, and even though he may find some statements questionable, he should not be over-hasty in his condemnation of them. Indeed, the remainder of the book will repay a careful reading.

There are two points to which we would draw attention in particular, one in decided praise of both author and translator, the other in which we have to find fault with the latter. The first point to commend is the unconditional condemnation of Freud and his followers. The words of the author are worth quoting: "It seems to me," he says on pp. 338 ff, "out of the question to seek to reconcile Catholic philosophy, and the fundamental truths it incorporates, with psycho-analytical theories. Anyone who attempts this synthesis must have lost sight either of the axioms upon which the whole psycho-analytical theory is based or of the ultimate meaning of Catholic philosophy. Thirdly, we must point out that, from the standpoint of both theoretical and practical psychology, certain tenets forming integral parts of the psycho-analytical system are open to serious criticism." He reinforces this contention in a footnote on p. 339, and in several places in his work he attacks the Pleasure principle which is the basis of psycho-analysis. Readers who would like to see how just is this contention may be referred to an article, "Religion and Conscience," by Dr. J. G. Vance, in the *Clergy Review* for April, 1931.

In the second place, we do not think that Dr. Allers can be called a Catholic Adlerian, as the translator would label him. It is truer to say that he is to some extent influenced by Adler. The author himself says, after his criticism of Freud, "On the other hand, we are equally indisposed to give an uncritical assent to the theories of individual-psychology as set forth to-day by most of the adherents of this school, although we are of opinion that it enables us to approach the truth more nearly than psycho-analysis"; and on p. 94, "It must, however, be admitted that the school

of individual-psychology usually fails to pay much attention to the philosophical assumptions or consequences arising out of its doctrine. In my opinion, indeed, its point of view is often upside down. The 'metaphysic of the person' upon which I insisted in the treatise—'Character as Expression'—is not regarded by this school as a methodological necessity for the construction of its system. This, however, does not detract from the credit due to individual-psychology for its methodologically pure idea. . . " Now, this certainly applies to Adler. For him, character is the result of environmental influences which determine the traits of the child at an early age—about four years old,—after which the "attitude of life" is fixed once and for all. Whereas for Allers there is no term to the transmutability of character (see pp. 10 ff), precisely because it is the person and not the Community who primarily shapes his character, and he can do so because he is free (pp. 42 ff). Hence we must understand by "the methodologically pure idea," for which he gives credit to Adler, the necessity of deriving character from a person's own reactions as far as is possible, before having recourse to heredity.

In conclusion, we may point to the blemishes to which reference was made at the beginning. These are the use here and there of technical medical terms which will convey no meaning to the general reader and for which the translator might have substituted plain terms. For instance, instead of allowing the word "hypoplasia" to stand on p. 305, he might have said "the defect of some tissue or organ." Similarly for "schizothyme" and "cyclothyme" on p. viii. of the Preface,—the latter term denoting manic-depressive insanity, a type of mental disorder characterized by alternations of mania and melancholy, while the former is practically equivalent to "dementia praecox," of which three forms are distinguished, the symptoms varying from extreme stupor to extreme agitation,—other words might have been given.

Of course, the work differs entirely from those of Adler and the rest in claiming that no treatment of character can be complete which does not take into account the necessity of religion, and particularly the Catholic religion, in character-formation. The religious ideal is not merely a "fictive" one, as these would have it, but a real, practical one. It is only necessary to refer to such passages as pp. 238 ff, pp. 106 ff, pp. 368 ff, but there are many others.

2—A CENTENARY LIFE OF ST. PATRICK¹

THERE are not many points upon which the biographers of the great Apostle of Ireland are agreed, but one of these is that he was consecrated Bishop in the year 432 and that he set out at once to begin his missionary labours in the land he was to render illustrious. In timely anticipation of the fifteenth centenary of his arrival in Strangford Lough, Dr. Helena Concannon who is not only a most competent investigator of Irish ecclesiastical history but who in several earlier works has given proof of her ability to combine sound scholarship with a genuine spirit of piety, has been encouraged to prepare a popular Life of the Saint which will be at the same time abreast of modern criticism. The task she has undertaken is by no means an easy one. To ignore the numberless controverted points in St. Patrick's history would be inconsistent with the conception of a scholarly book and would hardly be representative of Irish learning, but on the other hand to devote much space to unending discussions of legendary matters and points of detail would be to deprive the volume of all literary charm and to frighten away the devout readers whom the writer has most at heart to attract. So far as we can judge, Dr. Concannon is very successful in striking the happy mean. Her book is not so overweighted with learning as to banish either devotion or freshness of treatment, and on the other hand, while it is not too bulky, no critic will be tempted to accuse her of being unacquainted with the research devoted to the subject in recent years. In one or two brief but pregnant appendices Dr. Concannon discusses some vital points of topography and chronology: she is inclined to surrender the time-honoured reading *silvam focluti*, which has inspired so many dithyrambs in Patrick's biographers, in favour of the *silvam virgulti* which appears in the later manuscripts. The latter version, she thinks, lends itself better to the understanding of the Saint's design in making for Strangford Lough to effect his landing. This conclusion also probably has influenced her in adopting Slemish rather than the slopes of Croag Patrick as the scene of his captivity. We are rather surprised that the author seems to have made no reference to the mention of the great Apostle in the Senchus Mor. There is surely a most venerable antiquity underlying the modernized enactments of that ancient code. There are some excellent illustrations as well as a good index, and it is not to be doubted that this admirable specimen of devout hagiography will find a generous welcome during the coming centenary year.

¹ *Saint Patrick, His Life and Mission.* By Mrs. Thomas Concannon, M.A., D.Litt. Longmans. Pp. xxxiv. 260. Price, 6s. n. 1931.

3—THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST¹

THE unfathomable mysteriousness of the Incarnation lies in the union under one Personality of two natures, that of God and that of man. Understanding by "nature" all that a human being has in common with his fellows, and by "personality" that which makes him this man distinct from others, we cannot understand how in the case of Our Lord the Godhead can supply for a human personality; still less can we grasp the inter-relations of the two natures which are thus united without fusion or mixture. The various heresies in regard to the Incarnation which broke out early in the Church's history and which are alive or reviving to-day, reflect the impatience of the human intellect before this insoluble mystery. Many outside the Church have come to whittle away the perfect Godhead of Christ because they cannot see how, being God, He could effectively "empty" Himself, how it could "behave Him in all things to be made like to His brethren," how He could actually "have been tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin." Because of the seeming incompatibility between His acts and experiences as Man and His infinite power and dignity as God, they are led to deny His divinity. Catholics, however, who take God's revelation on Faith, whilst feeling unable to reconcile, by merely human intelligence, the fact that One who was essentially God yet lived, spoke and acted as man, still accept both facts. They worship Christ as God the Son, yet regard Him too as the first born amongst many brethren. Their awe of Him as the infinite Deity does not check their love of Him as a Man like themselves: nor does the familiar intercourse He allows lead them to forget His Majesty. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit in the Church the balance is duly kept in the main, but one or other aspect of the Incarnate Deity has been prominent at different ages. Professor Karl Adam of Tübingen whose classic work, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, is doubtless familiar to our readers, has felt that to-day, when Arianism is so common outside the Church, there is need of emphasizing the Humanity of Christ, and has written a stimulating book, *Christ our Brother*, with that object. He is able to show, through the researches of Father Joseph Jungmann, S.J., in the ancient liturgies, that the schismatic Greek Church, influenced by Arianism and the writings of St. John Chrysostom against that heresy, suffered a "complete revolution in Christology," which has obscured the mediatorship of Our Lord and prevented, to a large extent, the due development and influence of the Eucharistic cultus. There is no danger in the Catholic Church, where the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ is to-day being made ever clearer, of such lamentable per-

¹ *Christ Our Brother*. By Karl Adam. Translated by Dom J. McCann, O.S.B. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. vi. 209. Price, 7s. 6d.

version. Still Professor Adam's book is a welcome aid to the fuller understanding of our heritage in Christ and as carrying on the influence of such works as Father Meschler's *Humanity of Jesus* and Archbishop Goodier's great *Public Life of Our Lord*. We have only to consider the chaos of Christological opinion outside the Church, even amongst those who think they believe in Christ's divinity, to recognize the benefit of such clear guidance as these books afford. We have noticed one or two instances of a lack of theological precision—"Jesus conjoins Himself and His Father in a unity in which no *other* creature can share" (21). "Our Lord's . . . was the life of a unique personality, at once divine and *human*" (22)—which should be corrected in a further edition.

4—A SOURCE BOOK OF MEDIAEVAL CHURCH HISTORY¹

OF late years Source Books have become very much the fashion all over Europe. It certainly is desirable that serious students should be brought into touch with original texts. The attitude of mind, the language used, the very limitations in the outlook of contemporaries, have all their importance. And this is perhaps more noteworthy in ecclesiastical even than in secular history. We are so content to believe that the Church is always the same, as indeed she is with regard to the fundamentals of doctrine, that the youth who wholly depends for his knowledge upon some compendium of our ecclesiastical annals is apt to read into these records of the past the whole complexus of ideas with which he is familiar in the Church as he knows it at present. This is certainly regrettable and is bound in the end to result in shocks which may be dangerous to his peace of mind and even to his Faith.

Father Charles Silva-Tarouca, S.J., Professor of History in the Gregorian University, Rome, has collected and arranged an admirable selection of texts which are representative of the life of the Latin Church in western Europe from the fifth to the ninth century. He has wisely not confined himself to the chronicles alone, indeed these, as such, are rather kept in the background, though we may note that he has made an exception for our own Venerable Bede from whom generous extracts are printed which cover more than twenty pages. By preference it is the personal, human and characteristic traits, those more especially which bear upon the great work of conversion to God and the raising of morals to the Christian standard, which are conspicuous in the choice Father Silva-Tarouca has made among the copious

¹ *Fontes Historiae Ecclesiasticae Medii Aevi. Pars Prima, Fontes saeculi V.—IX*; selegit Carolus Silva-Tarouca: Romae, Apud Aedes Universitatis Gregorianae, 1930, pp. xvi, 546.

materials at his disposal. No category of Christian literature seems to have been excluded, but extracts from letters and biographies predominate. On the other hand specimens are also included of such important official enactments as conciliar canons, the Visigoth and Lombard codes of law, the Penitential attributed to St. Theodore and the formularies of the Liber Diurnus. In the documents belonging to the eighth century those connected with England are exceptionally prominent, and the influence of the flourishing Irish Church is made evident at least indirectly in many of the Continental citations. For it is to be remarked that the compiler has in every case prefixed to his citations a short but sufficient notice containing all necessary information about the source to which the reader is introduced. There is further an excellent alphabetical index and a very common-sense but eloquent preface, in true classical diction from which Father Silva-Tarouca finds it sometimes necessary to condescend to such neologisms as *suprematia politica* or *magna catastrophes sæculi XVI.*

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGICAL.

A BOOK from Fr. Lippert must always be considered as a valuable gift to the public, and *Die Kirche Christi* (Herder: 3.50 m.), is no exception. The author seems to be strongest when he analyses the psychosis of modern mentality; it is with this sympathetic frame of mind that he pictures the Church of Christ in a manner and in aspects which appeal to our time. Many are hampered in their recognition of her by the faults which they observe in her members or officials; many, considering her stormy history, lose sight of what is essentially due to Christ's positive institution under the vicissitudes of outward conditions and imperfect instruments. Father Lippert meets these difficulties without adopting a merely apologetic treatment. He shows the Church, first as she appears historically, in past and present; then in her quality of a religious organization with a clearly defined nature; finally, as an object of faith. In this third part the author describes with fine skill the internal life of the Church, kept fresh through her intimate connection with Christ, and the influence of this fact on those inside and outside her fold.

MORAL.

We have read with very great pleasure the Reprint of a lecture by Dr. H. L. Goudge, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, on *The Question of Contraceptives* (League of National Life: 1s.). We welcome this contribution to the case against Contraceptives, for it is well and cogently put. Dr. Goudge however, does not state the case exactly as Catholics would state it, especially on its ethical lines which, we hold, are perfectly valid. We do not agree that

the "really convincing reply rests upon the Christian view of life and our belief in the resources of grace." Reason also, we hold, gives a convincing reply. The story on page 25 is very telling. In Note 5, p. 29, Dr. Goudge, we regret to say, misunderstands the Catholic teaching as much as did the Bishops at Lambeth.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

Father Cotter's *Cosmologia* (The Stratford Company, Boston: \$3.50), is a model of compactness and clarity of exposition. The abundance of objections, compressed to tabloid brevity, will be welcomed by student-philosophers striving to arm themselves for debate: and their preceptors are even likely to be daunted by the superabundance of references to other works which the author supplies. It is comforting to find Fr. Cotter stoutly defending the formal objective existence of the sensible qualities, the non-multiplicity of substantial forms, and other traditional, but hotly contested, positions. It is disappointing, though not perhaps surprising, to discover that he divides the main opinions on the prime formal effect of quantity into Suarezian and Thomist, attaching the latter label to the bestowal of "internal situational extension." The subsequent statement: "Impossibile utique est *imaginari* meram extensionem situlem internam," sufficiently reveals how alien is this opinion from any doctrine of St. Thomas. Nor is the Doctor of the Eucharist to be dismissed with the bald assertion "quaestionem hanc datâ operâ non tractavit." The existence and nature of a clear and precise doctrine of quantity in the writings of St. Thomas have long since been demonstrated, notably, in recent times, by Father Billot in his magisterial treatise *De Eucharistia*. Father Cotter, with admirable firmness, rejects the non-Euclidian space and geometries of the modern physicists as "pura figmenta mentis," but he admits the so-called "Law of entropy," and, of course, bases upon it a proof of the finite age of the world. This latter procedure accords ill with his own wise comment (p. 127) on the fundamental instability of present-day physical theory. The carefully chosen and contrasted types, the spacing and general get-up of the book reflect immense credit on author and publisher.

DEVOTIONAL.

Another of Père Raoul Plus's little explanatory treatises has been translated from the French. It is called *The Eucharist* (B.O. & W.: 3s. 6d.), and in less than a hundred pages sets forth the proof and meaning of the dogma and the central place it holds in the worship and devotion of the Church, and the "edification" of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Although advocated many years ago by Father Faber, who translated Blessed L. M. Grignon de Montfort's "True Devotion to the Blessed Virgin," the particular methods of practising the devotion taught by that holy writer seem never to have become popular amongst us, whether because of his uncompromising "foreign" name or because of his use of the term "slaves" (which Britons never shall be) or for some other reason. But theological development since Blessed de Montfort's time has shown the soundness of his teaching and the

recent institution of the Feast of Our Lady, "Mediatrice of All Graces" confirms his main contention,—that the Blessed Virgin holds something of the same relation towards the Mystical Body of Christ as she held towards His natural Body. The detailed exposition of this doctrine contained in *The Secret Way of the Enclosed Garden* (B.O. and W.: 5s.), by Père François Pilet, S.M.M., and recently translated, should, in spite of its somewhat fanciful title, do much to recommend it to English readers.

HISTORICAL.

The tragedy of the war has for this generation obscured the memory of the fierce political conflicts that immediately preceded it—the fight for Home Rule and the militant Suffragette-ism—two seemingly forlorn causes which the upheaval of the greater cataclysm brought to victory. In *The Suffragette Movement: an Intimate Account of Persons and Ideals* (Longmans: 21s. n), Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, one of its foremost leaders, has recalled in unsparing detail the half-score pre-war years of growing agitation which reflects so little credit on inconsistent politicians and, for that matter, on many of those who were trying to bring them to a sense of justice. There was this much to be said for the politicians, that the "Votes for Women" agitation was at the start inextricably mixed up with the Socialist movement, to which indeed its chief begetters belonged, and Socialism then was more intransigent and more disreputable than it has since become. Although justice and freedom were essentially involved in the removal of woman's political disabilities, the high ideal of religious liberty, such as inspires our perennial fight for our educational rights, did not permeate this rather sordid struggle, which was stained by many criminal acts and only relieved by the remarkable courage and unselfishness of many of the women agitators. We are glad that the author disapproved of the campaign of secret arson inaugurated by her sister; more than anything else that immoral policy damaged the cause it was meant to help. The book on the whole is painful reading, but it is written with commendable fairness and objectivity.

FICTION.

Ferdinand Hoorman, author of *Rivals on the Ridge* (Herder: 8s.), excels in picturesque descriptions of natural scenery but his psychology is not on the same level. Consequently, his characters are rather wooden and inconsistent. However, the story is readable and the denouement satisfactory.

With a definite "apologetic" purpose the well-known French writer, "Pierre L'Ermite" has published *Le Monsieur en Gris* (La Bonne Presse: 5.00 fr.), but the lessons are introduced so adroitly that they do not interfere with the glamour of what is a wholesome and interesting romance. It is copiously and beautifully illustrated.

Another story which points attractively a plain and helpful moral is *Marie-Stella* (La Bonne Presse: 5.00 fr.), by Jean Vézère—a picture of a girl who finds her happiness in unselfishness and the peace of a good conscience, the shadows being provided by the careers of others not so minded.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. John Gibbons, author of the famous *Tramping to Lourdes* and several similar books, is a born story-teller, with a keen eye to the dramatic, the picturesque and the amusing. These gifts are conspicuous in his *Twenty-four Vagabond Tales* (B.O. and W.: 5s.), which narrate happenings in different parts of Europe, all told with verve and point and unstudied aptness of language. How much is fact and how much fancy we cannot guess: what is certain there is a basis of real experience in every tale. And in most of them only what a Catholic could furnish, a glimpse of the salutary activities of the Catholic faith.

A little book on religious institutes, their founders, and other things connected with them, is *Sous le Froc et le Voile*: by José Vincent (Flammarion, Paris: 12.00 fr.). It is very brightly written, full of vivid, yet accurate, imagination, hits almost humorously at many popular prejudices, and is altogether a book which non-Catholics might well read, as a true exposition of many things they think so terrible in the lives of Religious. The chapters are short, and cover accounts, not only of some twenty Religious Orders, but also of their spirit. Of its kind, it is one of the completest little books we know.

The study of Rhetoric is looked on by many with suspicion; perhaps that accounts for the low standard of oratory in many pulpits and on many platforms to-day. Speaking is an art, and as an art it has its rules. Those rules go back to Aristotle, and there is no master-artist in speaking who has not followed them, in almost every case consciously, in all cases at least sub-consciously. No one who has either studied, or still more, taught the art of rhetoric can really treat that art with anything but respect and even affection. A new text-book of the art of Rhetoric has appeared under the title: *Persuasive Speech; the art of Rhetoric for Colleges*, by Francis P. Donnelly, S.J. (Kenedy: \$2.25). It is a truly excellent book. Obviously, it is founded upon that classic text-book *Ars Dicendi* by Kleutgen, than which there is no better in modern times. But Father Donnelly has not slavishly translated Kleutgen; he has digested him and then re-written him entirely in his own language, and according to his own method; and he has enriched his course with literally hundreds of illustrative passages, chiefly from nineteenth century orators in America and England. These passages are used for the most part as exercises for the student. He is made to analyse them, to parallel them, to criticize them, and in other ways to use his own brains to develop the art of rhetoric practically for himself by means of these modern models. The selection of passages alone makes the book most interesting reading, and even one who is no longer a student will find not a few hints from these extracts. We congratulate the author on an excellent piece of work, the fruit, as he tells us of twenty-five years of teaching rhetoric to young students.

SOCIOLOGY.

The Anglican Bishop of Southwark, Dr. Cyril Forster Garbett, is honourably distinguished by the zeal and energy which he devotes to the problem of providing decent housing in his diocese. By speech and writing he never tires in calling public attention to that blot on

our civilization—the fact that, in one of the richest cities of the world, about 100,000 people are living in sub-human conditions, herded together in insanitary dwellings amidst unspeakable filth and squalor, moral and material. In his very human little book—*In the Heart of South London* (Longmans: 3s. 6d. n.), the Bishop gives a vivid picture of the appalling social conditions in which, in spite of all the relief-agencies at work, a vast number of the poor live, neither exaggerating the horrors nor forgetting the widespread efforts to remove them. These efforts must be multiplied in the future and industrial operations so modified and controlled as to make it possible for the workers to lead human lives; otherwise our civilization itself may perish. For a temperate yet telling exposure of its present needs, Dr. Garbett's book is to be recommended to all sociologists.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

Amongst new C.T.S. publications we find **Father Daniel Considine, S.J.**, by Father F. Devas, S.J., a pamphlet which many, consoled by *Words of Encouragement*, will be anxious to read; **Facts for Free-thinkers**, from the German of Heinrich Schunck, setting forth truths which Rationalists generally ignore: Father de Ternant contributes an Appendix showing what services Catholics have done to Science; **The Vatican Council**, by Dom D. Pontifex, O.S.B., based on Dom Butler's famous history; **Why shouldn't I?** by G.H., a striking presentation of the ideal of perfection for children; **The Legend of St. Christopher** (small format), by E.B.; and finally **The Mystery Window**, etc., tales by S. M. Ancilla. Amongst reprints there are **Monastic Life**, by Dom A. Parker, O.S.B.; **The Blessed Sacrament**, by Cardinal Manning; **Holy Images and the Crucifix**, by Fathers S. Smith and C. Lattey, **The Anti-God Front of Bolshevism**, by Rev. G. J. MacGillivray; **St. Bernard**, a vivid little biography, by Father Henry Tristram, Cong. Orat; **The Rationalist as Prophet**, by J. Keating, S.J., a counterblast to Mr. McCabe's "Decay of the Church of Rome"; **St. Hugh of Lincoln**, revised edition, and in the smaller format Cardinal Vaughan's **Devotions to St. Peter**.

From the C.T.S. of Ireland comes a remarkable series of extracts from the works of Canon Sheehan, all bearing on the work and influence of Our Lord and called **Jesus Christ, Yesterday, To-day and the Same For Ever**. It is a revelation to find so much sound and eloquent instruction conveyed through fiction, and it gives an insight into what is meant by a Catholic novelist. **The Canon of the Scriptures**, apparently by a Franciscan Father, is a useful account of how we got the Bible and how it is authenticated and guaranteed: a capital booklet to give to a "Bible-Christian." But at the beginning of chapter i., it is implied that Latin is the language of the Church—a statement which needs definite qualification. **Patrons and Protectors**, compiled by Dorothy Blount, is a highly interesting account of some 29 saints whose aid is specially invoked by various professions or in various emergencies. Many are familiar, but we confess not to have known that St. Stanislaus was a Protector against Heart-disease, or St. Phocas Patron of Gardens. A new edition should include—and thus reach round numbers—St. Zita, Patron of Domesticity.

An interesting study of a little-known Saint, **Blessed Peter Faber, S.J.**, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius, has been written for the C.T.S. of Ireland by the Rev. M. Bodkin, S.J.

An off-print from *La Nouvelle Revue Théologique* for July last gives a very sound and luminous account of **Le Mouvement religieux en Angleterre (Etat actuel)**, by Mr. Douglas Carter, which should do something to disabuse French readers of the mistaken ideas of Anglicanism still existing on the Continent.

The Abbot of Maria-Laach, Dom Ildefons Herwegen, delivered a lecture during the war on **The Art Principles of the Liturgy** (Liturgical Press: Minnesota), which translated from the 5th German Edition, by the Rev. W. Busch, has been added to the "Popular Liturgical Library." It shows that the whole purpose of the Church's worship is to "transfigure" the material into the spiritual, the earthly into the heavenly, by the double process of undoing the effects of her Fall and erecting the new creation of grace.

Recent numbers of the **Catholic Mind** (July 22, Aug. 8 and 22, Sept. 8 and 22, Oct. 8) (America Press: each 5 c.), contain discourses on the value of retreats, Pope Pius XI. on "Catholic Action," Archbishop Goodier on "Christendom's Debt to St. Dominic" and Mr. T. Woodlock on "The Church the Defender of Human Liberty." Also "St. Robert Bellarmine," papers reprinted from **THE MONTH**, an account of the Biblical Commission and many other valuable articles. We also acknowledge a series of pamphlets from the pen of that veteran foe of the materialistic Evolutionist, Father J. P. LeBuffe, S.J.,—**Human Evolution and Science** (now in its 7th thoroughly revised edition), **So This is Evolution!**, **Misguided Evolutionists**, and **God and some Scientists**: valuable ammunition for the Catholic apologist.

The recent celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the establishment of the Benedictine Fathers in Thanet (St. Augustine's Abbey, Ramsgate) has received permanent record in the first number of **The Thanet Catholic Review**, which will appear quarterly and is priced at 6d. (2s. 8d. per annum, post free). The whole issue is devoted to describing the first coming of the monks and the growth and history of St. Augustine's. We trust that a corner of England so particularly Benedictine and the alumni of the school will give generous support to the new venture.

From the Liturgical Press, Minnesota, which has done, and is doing, so much for the popularization of the Liturgy comes a revised edition of the **Small Catechism of the Mass**, by Paul Bussard, which explains in simple language both the structure and the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist.

Father Aloysius, O.M.Cap., author of a larger Prayer Book, has also compiled a smaller one for children called **Close to Jesus** (Gill and Son: 1s. 6d.) which, tastefully bound and adorned with many nicely-coloured illustrations, will be very popular.

A second selection from Father W. Roche's well-known **A Child's Prayers to Jesus**, also illustrated, is published by Messrs. Longmans at one penny.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- AMERICA PRESS, New York.**
The Catholic Mind. Vol. XXIX.
 Nos. 16—20. Price, 5 c. each.
 Several 10 c. pamphlets.
- BASIL BLACKWELL, Oxford.**
Lucian, Plato and Greek Morals.
 By John J. Chapman. Pp. v. 181.
 Price, 6s. n.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.**
The English Cardinals. By G. C. Heseltine. Pp. xv. 207. Price, 5s.
A History of Prior Park College. By Br. J. S. Roche. Pp. xvi. 318. Price, 15s.
The Music of the Roman Rite. By Sir R. R. Terry. Pp. ix. 293. Price, 10s. 6d.
The Burning Soul of St. John of the Cross. By R. Hoornaert. Trans. by A. Thorold. Pp. 71. Price, 3s.
St. Elizabeth's Leper. By E. R. Spurr. Price, 6d.
Consummata. From the French of R. Plus, S.J. By Geo. Baker. Pp. xii. 337. Price, 7s. 6d.
St. Hugh of Lincoln. By Joseph Clayton. Pp. xxi. 237. Price, 6s.
- CATHOLIC SOCIAL GUILD, Oxford.**
The Future of Capitalism. By Lewis Watt, S.J. Pp. 72. Price, 1s. n.
- C.T.S., London.**
Many Twopenny Pamphlets and Reprints.
- C.T.S. of Ireland, Dublin.**
Blessed Peter Faber, Price, 2d.
- COLE & Co., London.**
Report of the 34th Annual Conference of Catholic Colleges. Pp. 214. Price, 2s.
- DENT & SONS, London.**
A History of the Popes. By Fernand Hayward. Pp. xvii. 405. Price, 12s. 6d. n.
- GILL & SON, Dublin.**
Close to Jesus. Illustrated. Pp. 88. Price, 1s. 6d.
- HERDER AND Co., Freiburg.**
Das Leben des Bl. Ignatius von Loyola. By Viktor Kolb, S.J. Pp. x. 160. Price, 3.40 m. St.
- Franz Xaver, der Trapdre Mann.* By Sophie zu Eltz. Pp. 53. Price, 3.00 m.
- B. HERDER, London.**
The Mass. By Rev. S. Czerniejewski. Pp. 112. Price, 2s.
The Heart of the Fathers. By Rev. M. A. Chapman. Pp. vii. 371. Price, 8s. 6d.
- HUTCHINSON, London.**
World Peace and Armaments. By A. J. Jacobs. Pp. 183. Price, 5s. n.
- KEGAN PAUL & Co., London.**
The Mind and its Body. By Charles Fox. Pp. xii. 316. Price, 15s. 6d. n.
- LONGMANS, London.**
Temples of Eternity. By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Pp. vi. 145. Price, 5s. n.
The Hidden Years. Illustrated. By John Oxenham. Pp. xii. 244. Price, 7s. 6d. n.
- MILLER, Ottawa.**
Three plays by Francis W. Grey. Pp. 41, 32, 40.
- MISSION PRESS, Techny., Ill.**
Psychologia. By Gerard Esser, S.V.D. Pp. xvii. 515.
- NISBET, London.**
The Ground of Faith and the Chaos of Thought. By Oliver C. Quick. Pp. 152. Price, 5s. n.
- RELIGION Y CULTURA, Madrid.**
XV. Centenario de la Muerte de San Augustin. Pp. 521.
- SANDS & Co., London.**
The Sword of the Spirit. By the Rev. Robert Eaton. Pp. 185. Price, 3s. 6d. n.
- SHEED & WARD, London.**
A Sheed and Ward Anthology. Pp. 401. Price, 5s.
- THE HOGARTH PRESS, London.**
A Letter on Disarmament. By Viscount Cecil. Pp. 40. Price, 1s.
- THE SENTINEL PRESS, New York.**
The Sixth National Eucharistic Congress (Omaha). Pp. 240. Price, \$2.00.

